MARKET POSITIONING THEORY: APPLICABILITY TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC RADIO STATIONS OPERATED BY INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

By

CAROLYN ELIZABETH POOLE

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1989

Copyright 1989

by

Carolyn Elizabeth Poole

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Gratitude is expressed to members of my doctoral committee, Dr. James L. Wattenbarger, chairman, Dr. C. Arthur Sandeen, Dr. Phyllis M. Meek, and Dr. Joseph R. Pisani, for their patience and professional assistance during my completion of the dissertation project.

Appreciation is due for the continuous encouragement from my family through the years: special thanks to my mother, Georgia M. Poole, for teaching me the value of higher education, for her unfailing love and sacrifice in my behalf; to my father, the late Wesley W. Poole, for nurturing my media interest at an early age with a lavish assortment of radio sets, from pocket-size transistors to short-wave; to D.J. Harrison, for her caring coupled with persistent prods.

I was companioned through many late nights by the Wave (WHVE), the Cab (WCAB), and Magic (WMGI), while living my own sequel to "The Paper Chase."

Thanks are also extended for the invaluable support, advice, and cheers from Dr. Tina, Dr. Richard, Dr. Zolika, Dr. Bob, Dr. Gene, and Dr. Jim, who all inspired me to join the doctoral ranks. And now, friends, "let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter" (Ecclesiastes 12:13).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES vi

ABSTRACT viii

CHAPTER

I INTRODUCTION 1

Introduction to the Problem 1
Statement of the Problem 15
Delimitations and Limitations 17
Justification for the Study 19
Research Methodology 28
Definition of Terms 31
Organizations of Subsequent Chapters 34

II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 35

Introduction 35
The Media Milieu 36
The Relationship Between Public Radio and Higher Education 41
Market Positioning Theory 50
Summary 62

III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 64

Introduction 64
Design of the Study 64
Expert Panel Selection 65
Research Population 65
Sample Selection 66
Instrumentation 68
Data Collection 77
Data Analysis 79
Summary 85

IV PRESENTATION OF RESULTS 86

Introduction 86
Research Question One 86
Research Question Two 97
Research Question Three 123
Summary 137

V SUMMARY, INTERPRETATION, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 139

Introduction 139
Summary of the Research 139
Interpretation of Results 144
Discussion 150
Implications 153
Recommendations for Further Research 154

APPENDICES

A SUMMARY OF POSITIONING STRATEGIES AND TACTICS. . 156

B PANEL OF EXPERTS 159

C COVER LETTER TO PANEL OF EXPERTS 160

D WRITTEN POSITIONING SURVEY INSTRUMENT 161

E INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO STATIONS ADMINISTRATORS . 165

F TELEPHONE SURVEY CONFIRMATION FORM 166

G TELEPHONE POSITIONING SURVEY INSTRUMENT 167

H TELEPHONE SURVEY INTRODUCTION 169

I UNIVERSITY LICENSEES REPRESENTED IN THE TELEPHONE SURVEY 170

REFERENCES 172

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH 186

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. Selected Methods of Analysis for Each Hypothesis 84

2. Frequency Distribution of Expert Panel Scores: Survey Item by Import Rating 88

3. Frequency Distribution of Expert Panel Scores: Survey Item by Usage Rating 90

4. Measures of Central Tendency: Survey Item by Expert Panel Import Scores 92

5. General Distribution of Expert Panel Median Import and Usage Scores 93

6. Chi-Square Test and Cramer's V: Crosstabulation of Expert Panel Import and Usage Scores 95

7. Frequency Distribution of Administrators' Scores: Survey Item by Import Rating 98

8. Frequency Distribution of Administrators' Scores: Survey Item by Usage Rating 100

9. Frequency Distribution of General/Station Managers' Scores: Survey Item by Import Rating 102

10. Frequency Distribution of General/Station Managers' Scores: Survey Item by Usage Rating 104

11. Frequency Distribution of Program Directors' Scores: Survey Item by Import Rating 107

12. Frequency Distribution of Program Directors' Scores: Survey Item by Usage Rating 108

13. Frequency Distribution of Development/ Promotion Directors' Scores: Survey Item by Import Rating 111

14. Frequency Distribution of Development/ Promotion Directors' Scores: Survey Item by Usage Rating 113

15. One-Way Analysis of Variance: Administrative Group by Mean Import Scores . . . 116

16. One-Way Analysis of Variance: Administrative Group by Mean Usage Scores 119

17. Correlations of Import and Usage Scores: Positioning Strategy by Administrative Group . . 122

18. Prediction of Cumulative Audience Ratings From Positioning Usage: Strategy by Multiple Regression Statistics 130

19. Prediction of Membership Size From Positioning Usage: Strategy by Multiple Regression Statistics 133

20. Prediction of Advertising/Promotion Budget From Positioning Usage: Strategy by Multiple Regression Statistics 136

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

MARKET POSITIONING THEORY: APPLICABILITY TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC RADIO STATIONS OPERATED BY INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

By

Carolyn Elizabeth Poole

August 1989

Chairman: James L. Wattenbarger
Major Department: Educational Leadership

The purpose of this study was to investigate the utility of Ries and Trout's marketing-based positioning theory for administrators who operate public radio stations licensed to institutions of higher education. Positioning was defined as that aspect of marketing activity which focuses on making audiences believe that one station is really different from its competitors. The operationalized principles which comprise the theory were rated initially by a panel of experts in public broadcasting management, and those deemed important for use in public radio were retained for further examination in the collegiate setting.

Two survey research instruments consisting of theoretically-derived positioning techniques were employed to collect data from the expert panel and 96 administrators

representing 45 university-licensed stations. Data from other documented sources were also compiled as part of the ex post facto research. The findings lead to the following conclusions related to three research questions and seven hypotheses.

Experts affirmed 91% of the positioning strategies and tactics as valid and judged the majority as currently practiced in public radio. Some relationships between experts' import and usage ratings were found to be significant.

Administrators evaluated the importance and use of positioning favorably. Development/Promotion Directors were the most supportive of positioning, followed by General/Station Managers, then Program Directors. Some significant differences were detected among the three administrative groups in regard to perceived importance, but not in practice of positioning. Most relationships between administrators' import and usage ratings were significant.

Relationship between cumulative audience ratings and positioning use by station administrators was not statistically significant. Relationship between contributing membership size and positioning use by administrators also proved to be nonsignificant. Statistical significance was determined in the relationship

between advertising/promotion budget allocations and usage of the positioning strategy involving commitment.

The study was considered exploratory and the market positioning theory worthy of further research.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Problem

Theoretical Background

The theoretical base of educational administration is grounded in an interdisciplinary study of concepts derived from the social and behavioral sciences (Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1976). Educators have borrowed heavily from disciplines such as psychology, sociology, anthropology, political science, economics, and business management in the development of scientific formulas for use in schools. Theories about leadership styles, power structures, decision-making, change, organizational behavior, and general systems theory, for example, are not unique to education. Because administration occurs in the same generalized manner in educational, commercial, industrial, medical, and military organizations, it is the prerogative of administrators to draw ideas from diverse fields for testing and application in their own endeavors.

Marketing may be considered one of the more recent areas of study acknowledged as having relevancy to the higher education establishment. "Expressed in its most

basic terms, marketing is the performance of business activities that directs the flow of goods and services from producer to consumer (or user) in order to satisfy customers and accomplish the organization's objectives" (Montana, 1978, p. xi). Dartmouth College professor Neslin has simply explained marketing as being the design, communication, and distribution of products that meet the needs of consumers (Urban & Neslin, 1977). Harvard University business professor Levitt (1962) was one of the first scholars to postulate the notion that marketing involves much more than persuasive selling, a popular myth. In an age of material abundance, its focus must be on serving and satisfying human needs. One of the giants of general marketing theory, Northwestern University professor Kotler, elaborated on this underlying customer orientation in a speech:

> Marketing is not the art of finding clever ways to dispose of what you make. Marketing is the art of creating genuine customer value. It is the art of helping your customers become better off. The marketer's watchwords are quality, service, and value. Can you imagine what the world would be like if the marketing concept became a universal principle? (Kotler to receive, 1985, p. 1)

Strategies for effective marketing management have been keenly cultivated in the business world, where survival depends upon consumer acceptance and support. As nonprofit organizations such as colleges, hospitals, museums, and governmental agencies have increasingly recognized the role of marketing in enhancing their service functions, they have learned to adapt the corporate methods tested in living

laboratories of business and industry. A trend has emerged to regard marketing as a socially useful activity advantageous in many areas of human endeavor.

> Marketing is a pervasive societal activity that goes considerably beyond the selling of toothpaste, soap, and steel. Political contests remind us that candidates are marketed as well as soap; student recruitment by colleges reminds us that higher education is marketed; and fundraising reminds us that "causes" are marketed. (Kotler & Levy, 1969, p. 3)

The classic tasks of marketing include the development and improvement of new products and services, the pricing, availability, delivery of those products and services, as well as efforts to inform people about them. These basic elements constitute the "marketing mix," a term coined by Harvard business professor Borden (1965). The marketing mix is also commonly referred to as the "Four P's"--product, price, place, and promotion (McCarthy & Perreault, 1984). In a university setting, for instance, the product consists of a host of tangible and intangible ingredients known as education. Price includes not only monetary costs and financial assistance, but psychological costs as well. Academic calendar and physical location of facilities constitute place. Promotion can take the form of student recruitment, advertising, and public relations efforts.

An important fundamental philosophy that guides modern marketing theory and practice is a customer orientation which is sensitive to satisfying human needs. According to Kotler, this "marketing concept" can reconcile the interests

of individuals, organizations, and society. The key to accomplishing goals is to take into account the interests, needs, and desires of others (Kotler, 1976). The marketing concept is wholly compatible with the major tasks and commitments of public higher education with its aim toward responsiveness to its clientele in the sense that it emphasizes needs identification, systematic planning to meet those needs at the right time and place, clear communication, and follow-up assessment.

The import and application of marketing principles to higher education administration has been well documented for nearly two decades (Barton, 1978; Bassin, 1975; Beder, 1986; Berry & George, 1978; College Entrance Examination Board, 1980; Fram, 1973; Hugstad, 1975; Ihlanfeldt, 1975, 1980; Kotler, 1976; Kotler & Fox, 1985; Krachenberg, 1972; Lucas, 1979; Thompson, 1979; Urban & Neslin, 1977; Wilms & Moore, 1987). The pervasiveness of marketing throughout academe has been evidenced in the increasing number of marketing articles being published in scholarly journals, professional educational associations devoting more conferences, workshops, and sponsored research to marketing topics, and the proliferation of marketing teaching job advertisements appearing in The Chronicle of Higher Education (Litten, 1980).

In a survey of 1,000 university administrators, Alexander (1978) discovered that more than 90% of chief

executives favored the utilization of marketing strategies in the academic world and nearly three-quarters indicated that such practices were actually being used on their campuses. The attitudes of academic deans toward the marketing of higher education have also been examined and found to be positive. College deans responding from both public and private schools believed that marketing works in practice (and not just in theory), and is an adequate decision criterion in the day-to-day administration of higher education (Taylor & Judd, 1987).

Kotler (1979, 1987) has been credited with early application of marketing principles to higher education and has gone so far as to recommend that colleges employ vice presidents for marketing. He has often reminded educators, especially those who resist the transfer of supposedly alien business techniques to the ivory tower, that all organizations--even nonprofit ones--engage in marketing activities whether they acknowledge it or not. "Colleges, for example, search for prospects (students), develop products (courses), price them (tuition and fees), distribute them (announce time and place), and promote them (college catalogs)" (Kotler, 1979, p. 41). Additionally, a university is also carrying on marketing activity "when it solicits its alumni, when it lobbies at the state legislature, and even when a member of the faculty puts together a research proposal" (Krachenberg, 1972, p. 370).

Academician receptivity to marketing began in the 1970s when postsecondary educational institutions faced increased competition for declining enrollments and scarce resources. Some university administrators were then willing to consider new techniques to assuage the severity of these trends and ensure their very survival. As a reaction to these demographic and economic challenges, marketing ideas were encouraged and adopted by departments of admissions, public relations, alumni development, and institutional advancement.

Whether marketing is appropriate in higher education is no longer a relevant question. Today the attention of university leaders must be directed toward analysis of how well marketing concepts and strategies are being employed and how usage can best be expanded to more operations within the institution in order to improve the overall effectiveness of the organization, while at the same time recognizing its distinctive environment, resources, and mission (Lovelock & Weinberg, 1984, p. ix). Krachenberg of the University of Michigan has advised administrators to develop total marketing programs for their institutions.

> A major need, therefore, is to give universities a deeper appreciation for the value and spirit of marketing and to encourage them to make marketing a more formal and ongoing part of their administrative activites. Marketing must be seen as not just a series of often isolated institutional actions, but as a dynamic operational activity having numerous applications and multiple dimensions, which must be performed in an integrated manner. (1972, p. 370)

Positioning Defined

An indispensable part of the marketing process is choosing a position for one's product or service and determining some viable segment of the market to serve. This is a difficult step, but essential to the fulfillment of institutional purpose and mission. Positioning is an aspect of marketing activity that deliberately attempts to fix certain images of products in the consumers' minds relative to competing products, via informative messages. Lovelock and Weinberg, respected marketing experts and former Stanford University colleagues, explained positioning as

> the process of establishing and maintaining a distinctive place in the market for an organization as a whole and/or its product offerings. Positioning is concerned with the mental image of the product (or organization) held by consumers, donors, and other groups. A position is held with respect to performance on specific characteristics and in a competitive marketplace is usually related to the positions held by competing products or organizations. (1984, p. 192)

Theorists and practitioners in many fields, most vociferously in the advertising community, have espoused numerous applications and interpretations of positioning. The position of a product or service may refer to its objective, physical, and functional characteristics; or it may refer to the consumer's subjective mental perceptions of the product or service in relation to other brands (Smith & Lusch, 1976).

However it may be defined and used, positioning generally evokes rather competitive connotations. Simply put, there is no need for a positioning concept without competition (Ennis, 1982). Kotler specifically defined competitive positioning as "the art of developing and communicating meaningful differences between one's offer and those of competitors serving the same target market" (Kotler & Andreasen, 1987, p. 194).

It would seem obvious that positioning strategy is important in the communications stage of marketing, which includes advertising and promotion. More widespread, however, positioning actually permeates the entire marketing mix and provides a frame of reference crucial to guiding administrative decisions (Cravens, 1975).

Although the origins of market positioning can be traced back to the 1950s, renowned advertising professionals Al Ries and Jack Trout are generally credited with operationalizing this body of thought on a wide scale basis in the 1970s (Fox, 1985). The principles they expounded in a classic three-part series of articles (Trout & Ries, 1972a, b, c) included simple yet aggressive communication strategies for mastering the media and rapidly gained global appeal among advertising and marketing experts. It became evident by the 1980s that positioning had almost universal applicability to any form of human activity which involves communication. Positioning theory can be useful to anyone

who wants to promote a car, a cola, a computer, a college, a candidate, or even their own career (Ries & Trout, 1981).

Kotler was among the first to discuss the concept of positioning as a suitable marketing tool for academia, despite its "threat to the comfortable illusion that higher education is a sublime activity that needs no market engineering to survive" (1976, p. 55). The subsequent acceptance and usage of positioning strategies by administrators in higher education has also been adequately demonstrated by others (Geltzer & Ries, 1976; Ihlanfeldt, 1980; Leister, 1975; Litten, 1979; Litten, Sullivan, & Brodigan, 1983; Meyer, 1980; Neslin, 1986; Shaffer, 1978; Turner, 1982). Positioning has been embraced by academic leaders interested in assessing and/or reassessing their institutions' missions, markets, images, and the extent to which they are making a distinctive contribution to the general welfare, instead of merely copying the style of other organizations and claiming to be the best.

It is apparent that application of marketing theories--positioning concepts in particular--to the administrative functions within higher education is an idea worthy of serious consideration. It is one aim of the study reported herein to investigate its potential to augment the position of an often overlooked service of the university--public radio station broadcasting.

A University Service--Public Broadcasting

Since the late nineteenth century, public institutions of higher education have been created for three essential purposes: teaching, research, and service. It is dedication to the service function in particular that distinguishes the American university from other contemporary global systems of advanced learning (Brubacher & Rudy, 1968). Through dissemination of new ideas, cultural leadership, and provision of needed services directly to citizens outside the campus confines, the university strives to enrich the quality of life for its local, regional, and national constituents. Indeed, one might agree "the university as producer, wholesale and retailer of knowledge cannot escape service" (Kerr, 1972, p. 114). Admittedly, institutions attempt to fulfill their triadic mission with varying degrees of emphasis and enthusiasm. It is an obligation of all involved in university management, nevertheless, to extend some effort to understand and enhance the processes, mechanisms, and consequences of services within the scope of their administration.

Public radio stations, broadcasting from the halls of academe, are a service of the university and hold vast potential for advancing its public service goal. As such, these facilities have long been in need of focused attention by administrators. Few universities have even begun to tap these native institutional resources.

It is logical for institutions of higher education to be involved in the communications business since many of the first licensed radio stations in the United States grew out of experiments in university physics and engineering departments (Waller, 1946). When Guglielmo Marconi went to England in 1896 to patent his wireless telegraphy device, students at Tulane University in Louisiana and the University of Arkansas were simultaneously replicating the process of transmitting messages over long distances (Frost, 1937a). Those on college campuses who took an early interest in radio envisioned its potential as an instrument of education, primarily for the dissemination of adult education courses and facilitation of lifelong learning. "Broadcasting was called 'the people's university.' It would link rich and poor, young and old. It would end the isolation of rural life. It would unite the nation," wrote media historian Barnouw (1978, p. 12) about hopes for radio during its infancy. While the use of radio for formal instructional purposes dwindled with the rise of television, educators found that noncommercial stations based at their institutions helped to fulfill one of the vital missions of a university--public service. Simultaneously, this also met a federal legal obligation of broadcast licensees to operate in the "public interest, convenience, and necessity" (U.S.C., Title 47, Section 303).

Originally, "serving the people" meant extending the university's resources to all citizens in a state (Robertson & Yokom, 1973) and elevating the level of general public taste and values (Waller, 1946). A philosophical debate continues today regarding the social responsibility of educational broadcasters in their role of public service. Considering the ubiquitous reach of radio, are its programmers obliged to respond to popular demand or strive for higher aesthetic and cultural enrichment (Cook, 1968)?

Most educators recognize that all media are educational in the sense that they are endlessly informing, impressing, inspiring, interpreting, and influencing audiences of all ages. Whether intentionally or unintentionally, something is always being taught and learned via the airwaves. "Whereas the schools encounter some of the population for a fraction of the time, the mass media reach most of the population most of the time," explained media educator Stein (1979, p. 3). More Americans can be found in front of television sets than in college classrooms; and those enrolled in higher education spend more time listening to radio than they do in academic study.

> The media communicate culture, generally orient people in their society, influence their attitudes and values, and entertain in ways that add to knowledge and understanding. The scope and challenge of the media are at least equal in breadth to those of classroom curricula. (Stein, 1979, p. 111)

In light of the persistent exposure to media messages by their constituents, educational administrators in charge

of public radio stations must take a leadership role in utilizing their broadcast facilities and airtime in the most judicious manner. They must continually seek ways to improve the quality of the curriculum (programming service) and meet effectively the needs of their audiences. During the 1980s era of evaluation and accountability, executives at all levels of university management have learned to strive actively for nothing less than excellence. Progressive collegiate leaders who are open-minded and willing to investigate and adopt new practices based on sound theory will contribute to advancing their institutions' fulfillment of purpose to the benefit of society.

Fortunately, there are some basic, well-proven marketing principles--most notably, positioning--that have already been perfected through experience elsewhere and hold potential for enriching many more functions within the sphere of higher education administration. In the words of one sage public broadcasting educator, "All we need do is borrow the horse from another wagon, learn how it behaves, and harness it to ours. To do less is to invite obsolescence" (Kerr II, 1979, p. 24).

Summary of Introduction to the Problem

Throughout history educational administrators have eclectically borrowed theories from the social and behavioral sciences to apply to various functions of

schools. The last two decades have witnessed an increasing acceptance of marketing principles at the administrative levels of higher education. Marketing deals with uncovering and meeting human needs by supplying appropriate products that satisfy both consumer demands and institutional goals. In this context, marketing activity not only makes a meaningful contribution to the general welfare; it also is consistent with the philosophical orientation of leaders in educational organizations that strive to be responsive to the needs of their clientele.

One aspect of marketing theory in particular--market positioning--appears to be a viable tool for effective administration of higher education in the competitive environment which has intensified during the late twentieth century. Positioning focuses on the images of products and services as perceived by consumers. Al Ries and Jack Trout, recognized experts on the subject, have claimed that positioning has a broad range of applicability to many kinds of human activities. Ries and Trout (1981) theorized six major strategies for the positioning of products and services. These marketing-based strategies can be translated into relevant media vernacular for the purpose of this study and are summarized as follows:

Strategy 1: Focus on the audience.

Strategy 2: Focus on the competition.

Strategy 3: Find a market niche to fill.

Strategy 4: Require consistency throughout the entire positioning plan.

Strategy 5: Strive for simplicity in all communications.

Strategy 6: Establish long-term commitment to the positioning objective.

While its utility to and positive impact on some areas of academia have already been recognized and applauded, a question remains whether positioning theory may be suitable for enriching one specific service function of higher education for which administrators are held responsible--public radio broadcasting. The research that follows was undertaken in order to explore this possibility.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the study was to investigate the utility of Ries and Trout's marketing-based positioning theory for administrators who operate public radio stations licensed to institutions of higher education. The utility of the positioning theory was measured by expert opinion, practitioner usage, and specific outcome variables. The operationalized principles which comprise the theory were rated initially by a panel of experts in public broadcasting management and those deemed important for use in public radio were retained for further examination in the collegiate setting. The following questions were of particular concern:

1. What importance is placed upon Ries and Trout's positioning strategies and tactics by a panel of experts and to what extent are they being utilized in public radio?

2. What importance is placed upon the expert-verified positioning strategies and tactics by three groups of selected administrators and to what extent are they being utilized in university-licensed public radio stations?

3. Is the use of positioning in university-licensed public radio stations associated with higher cumulative audience ratings, greater contributing membership size, and larger percentage of financial budget allocated for advertising and promotional activities?

Additionally, the following hypotheses were tested:

HO_1. There is no relationship between the experts' ratings of the degree of importance and use of the positioning strategies and tactics in public radio stations.

HO_2. There is no difference between university station administrators classified as general managers, program directors, and development directors with regard to degree of importance assigned to the positioning strategies and tactics.

HO_3. There is no difference between university station administrators classified as general managers, program directors, and development directors with regard to use of the positioning strategies and tactics.

HO_4. There is no relationship between the degree of importance assigned to and use of the positioning strategies and tactics by the three administrative groups.

HO_5. There is no relationship between cumulative audience ratings and the use of positioning in selected university-licensed public radio stations.

HO_6. There is no relationship between contributing membership size and the use of positioning in selected university-licensed public radio stations.

HO_7. There is no relationship between percentage of financial budget allocated for advertising/promotional activities and the use of positioning in selected university-licensed public radio stations.

Delimitation and Limitations

The following confinements and weaknesses were observed in the conduct of the research:

1. The population was confined to public radio stations operated by institutions of higher education located in the United States. Furthermore, only those on-air FM stations designated as Class C (with maximum power of 100,000 watts) by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), and also qualified by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), were selected for study.

2. One of the methods chosen for gathering information about current positioning practices was the telephone survey. Due to the expense and impracticality of

interviewing all management personnel at all CPB-qualified radio stations, the research sample was confined to three groups of key individuals most directly involved with and/or responsible for station positioning. Their administrative titles included general/station managers, program directors, and development/promotion directors.

3. It was beyond the scope of this study to analyze the position of individual radio stations or make comparisons between different state institutions.

4. Generalizations of the findings to populations outside of the groups chosen to be studied herein should be considered speculative in nature, rather than conclusive.

5. It was recognized that data collected in the study represented the subjective opinions and perceptions of individuals in the sample groups regarding positioning at one point in time and that the findings may be subject to change in future research.

6. The report of findings and subsequent recommendations were treated in such a way as to be useful and applicable to public radio stations operated by public institutions of higher education. Therefore, the results of the study may not be universally applicable to other types of radio stations (e.g., AM, low-power educational, carrier current, religious, cable, or commercial stations) nor positioning situations involving other products or services.

Justification for the Study

The need for the study was justified on the basis of the following six points: a) historical distrust between the broadcasting industry and academia, and the resulting need for mutual cooperation between the two; b) a deficiency of radio research; c) past neglect of educational broadcasting; d) lingering confusion regarding the purpose and identity of public radio; e) the significance of positioning and marketing to nonprofit organizations, higher education in particular; and f) the lack of positioning research applicable to education and broadcasting.

Historical Distrust

The relationship between the broadcasting industry and academia has been historically characterized by mutual distrust, indifference, and even outright hostility (Head & Martin, 1957; Minow & Minow, 1976; Pennybacker, 1965, 1966; Stein, 1979; Woodliff, 1965; Wurtzel, 1980). The educational community in general has long been suspicious of the broadcast media. The intellectual tradition was based on the printed word, but broadcasting involves an unfamiliar technology not widely understood by educators. Fearing their ultimate replacement in schoolrooms, teachers and administrators have both resisted the adaptation of new communication techniques and often even ignored the educational potential of the media. Dragging well behind the status quo, professional educators have been the last

group to understand how to use the media effectively (Minow & Minow, 1976).

Part of the problem may be traced to the "intellectual arrogance" (Pennybacker, 1966) of some educators who have snubbed the popular media as crass and inferior amusements for the hoi polloi. Some in academia still cling to the "distorted image of commercial broadcasting as a cultural blight, whose interest to higher education is about on the same order as that of juvenile delinquency" (Head & Martin, 1957, p. 39). On the other side, those in the broadcasting industry have often seen educators as the fuzzy-minded intelligensia cloistered in ivory towers, contributing little to the real world (Pennybacker, 1965).

Another misunderstanding between educators and broadcasters has involved differing views of the role of research. It is customary for scholars to conduct research for the sake of advancing knowledge in a certain discipline. In the broadcasting industry, however, research is only one of the tools used for the purpose of decision-making and policy formulation. The failure of academic researchers to link theory with relevant issues has been a source of constant criticism by management executives (Wurtzel, 1980).

Solutions to the long-standing rift will require continuing discussion between the two communities and expanded opportunities to work closely together (Stein, 1979). Industry officials could tap more seriously the

research expertise of academic specialists. Scholars would gain the satisfaction of constructively affecting the public media which touch the lives of so many millions. Major misconceptions may be dispelled when both camps recognize the mutual benefits of cooperating to design the communications future.

The study reported herein was undertaken with these hopes in mind and to help bridge the gap between seemingly remote fields with new interdisciplinary knowledge.

Radio Research Deficiency

Although radio broadcasting has been an integral part of civilization for over a half century, it has not yet received the scholarly consideration its impact and endurance merits. "As an American social and cultural force, as a mass entertainment medium, as a commercial enterprise, as an art form, radio deserves the serious attention that scholars to date have not given it," one communications academician determined (Havig, 1979, p. 226).

Some studies can be found which focus on the historical development (Barnouw, 1982), audience ratings, and functional uses of radio (Trodahl & Skolnick, 1968). Many of the early radio analyses tended to be anecdotal, nostalgic, or laudatory (MacDonald, Marsden, & Geist, 1980). Since the late 1950s, television research has usurped much of the interest previously directed toward radio.

There has been some recent evidence that the study of radio may be in the process of revival and gaining respectability (Havig, 1979; MacDonald et al., 1980). Internal pressures within higher education against engaging in research of popular cultural topics have been waning. Public telecommunications have finally received academic legitimization.

The study described in this writing contributes to the creation of a new generation of scholarship dealing with a medium that is still a vital dimension of our national experience.

Educational Broadcasting Neglect

Educational broadcasting has been neglected and unappreciated throughout most of its stormy existence (Frost, 1937a; Robertson & Yokam, 1973; Siemering, 1969; Waller, 1946). Plagued by faculty indifference, lack of administrative support, insufficient funding, and commercial pressure (Severin, 1978), it seems almost miraculous that a noncommercial broadcasting system has survived as long as it has. With few exceptions, the majority of educational stations have been treated like "electronic sandboxes" (Robertson & Yokam, 1973) for students' extracurricular activities, pleasant frills but unworthy of serious consideration by college administrators.

Given the proper recognition and positioning, campus-based radio stations have the potential for being important

links with communities, resources for on-going communications research, public relations voices of the universities, and invaluable tools to further institutional goals (Siemering, 1969).

The significance of this study lies in its unique treatment of an entire class of higher educational enterprises--noncommercial, public radio stations--which have previously been undervalued or ignored by officials of the very institutions which spawned them. Educational radio, dubbed the "forgotten medium" (Fornatale & Mills, 1980), deserves understanding and enhancement by its own parental bodies.

Public Radio's Crisis

Educational broadcasting limped along on meager nourishment for decades until federal legislation in the 1960s infused the system with a healthy dose of status, elevated by a name change. "Educational" radio, which had implied drab and boring pedagogy, was transformed into a lively "public" medium, with promises of exciting entertainment and novelty (Rowland, Jr., 1986). Despite the obvious maturity of public radio in the 1980s, its administrators have still been haunted by lingering doubts as to the real purpose and identity of the medium. Siemering (1969) summarized the conflicting role expectations which have continued to confront educational broadcasters in recent eras:

> We must be academically respectable to receive institutional support but broadly based to receive public acceptance; we must have professional production to be competitive with the neighboring stations but retain enough solid content to be socially relevant. We must use the medium imaginatively but with one tenth of the resources of commercial stations. (p. 65)

Persistent questions about public radio purposes, identity, services, access, accountability, and positioning have remained relatively unanswered. In light of this confusion and ignorance, the need for a clear-cut image of public radio has emerged.

The research detailed herein was initiated to stimulate active discussion aimed at ultimate resolution of such issues. A distinct public radio image positioned in the contemporary marketplace would fill the chaotic void and stabilize its long-lived limbo.

Significance of Positioning and Marketing

As part of the marketing process, positioning is significant to nonprofit organizations, including higher education. Marketing is not inconsistent with nonprofit motives, and such organizations do face marketing problems similarly encountered by business enterprises. All of the operations involved in development of the product or service, how it is packaged, priced, and presented, should be geared to the goal of customer satisfaction.

> Marketing provides a point of view about the place of that organization in society. It helps determine when an organization is providing effective service and how it can renew itself in order to improve the delivery of that service. There is nothing contrary to the finest

> standards or ethical principles of any profession. Indeed, it may be the way to redeem the public reputation of some professions. (Wagner, 1978, p. 51)

Competition--whether acknowledged or unacknowledged--is a primary concern even in the nonprofit world. It may be less bold and risky than the form practiced on Wall Street, but nonprofit rivals do compete for clients, donors, resources, sales, operating surpluses, and market shares. Competition may be viewed as socially desirable because it spurs organizations to produce their best and to respond to customers' needs (Rados, 1981).

The argument that public institutions of higher education and their noncommercial radio stations are free from competition is unsubstantially naive. In reality both seek competitive advantages in their attempts to attract potential students and listeners, funding from sponsors and underwriters. In order to win their favors, management must reach them by means of marketing.

Higher education lacks a heritage of aggressive marketing (Berry & George, 1978). For the most part, university administrators' interest in marketing has focused on student recruitment and minor promotional endeavors. Many persons in academic circles still find the notion of marketing repugnant, associating it with hard-sell double-talk rather than fulfillment of consumer needs. Yet higher education is basically a service industry and all members of the university body are actually engaged in the business of

marketing their institution, whatever else they do (Kotler & Levy, 1969). "Regrettably, few faculty and few administrators perceive that they are performing a service. . . . Our failure to recognize this has been the primary reason for the declining credibility of our industry" (Ihlanfeldt, 1975, p. 136).

Responsive administrators of colleges and universities take interest in public perceptions of the institutional images reflected by their products and services. Campus-based radio broadcasting is one of the most prominent university services rendered to local constituencies. In a decade of change, diversity, and complexity, no service of the organization can afford to be left out of a marketing plan or survive without one.

> The positioning decision is often the crucial strategic decision . . . because the position can be central to customers' perception and choice decisions. Further, since all elements of the marketing program can potentially affect the position, it is usually necessary to use a positioning strategy as a focus for the development of the marketing program. A clear positioning strategy can insure that the elements of the marketing program are consistent and supportive. (Aaker & Shansby, 1982, p. 56)

The study reported herein expands the theoretical base of positioning and marketing knowledge apropos to public broadcasting units within the domain of higher education administration, heretofore undemonstrated.

Lack of Positioning Research

Positioning guidelines for educationally-owned broadcast stations have been conspicuously absent from the research literature. Much of the positioning advice from broadcasting, marketing, and advertising professionals has been intended for and exploited by the independent, commercial segments of broadcasting. Little, if any, of the valuable positioning modus operandi has filtered down to the noncommercial sector for utilization.

In relation to higher education administration, the applicability of market positioning has been somewhat limited to institutional image and student admissions studies (Meyer, 1980; Shaffer, 1978; Turner, 1982). There has been a noticeable shortage in educational literature regarding implementation of marketing methods to any university functions other than recruitment, public relations, and fund raising.

Previous positioning research which emanated from business administration departments dealt mostly with the impact of comparative advertising on product positioning (James, 1981; Villarreal Camacho, 1983). Prospective research connections among positioning, broadcasting, and education are as yet largely unformulated.

A review of Dissertation Abstracts International, plus the extensive compilations or research titles by Sparks (1962) and Kittross (1978), revealed a sufficient number of

academic studies of an historical-descriptive nature about college radio. They ranged from early works such as that by Christiansen (1949) to contemporary surveys like that by Leidman (1985). No educational researcher to date has investigated the potential benefits of positioning college-owned broadcasting facilities. One former communications graduate did examine listener perceptions of commercial AM radio station positioning (Kennedy, 1981). The report that follows, however, is the first of its kind to address specifically the positioning needs of public FM stations operated by institutions of higher education.

The import of this study is its contribution to a growing body of relevant positioning knowledge adaptable to several diversified fields. In particular, it supplies an essential link between higher education administration and broadcast management, for the betterment of the public airwaves.

Research Methodology

Procedures for this ex post facto research involved five distinct stages. The first stage was a thorough review of the related literature and research. The second stage consisted of development, testing, and modification of two survey instruments in the form of written and telephone questionnaires. Data collection from the expert panel, sample group, and other sources comprised the third stage. Included in the fourth stage was an analysis of the gathered

data. The final stage contained a discussion of the applicability of positioning theory to university-operated public radio stations, presentation of the recommendations, and identification of additional research needs.

A review of related literature and research revealed the prominence of Ries and Trout's positioning theory and its potential applicability to university-operated public radio broadcasting. Major principles which comprise the theory were operationalized and synthesized into a succinct list of positioning statements. A testing instrument containing these positioning strategies and tactics was constructed to measure perceptions of importance on a five-point Likert scale and to measure usage dichotomously. The purpose of the written instrument was to validate the literature-derived theoretical concepts by expert opinion, thereby establishing standards against which administrators' opinions and actual positioning practices in stations could be evaluated in later analysis.

A panel of experts, knowledgeable in the area of public broadcasting, was asked to judge the positioning strategies and tactics with respect to their theoretical feasibility in public radio stations. The expert panel was comprised of members of the Board of Directors of National Public Radio (NPR) and American Public Radio (APR), the major networks that supply programming products to university-operated stations.

The population of the study consisted of 171 public radio stations operated by institutions of higher education that met special criteria of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in order to receive financial funding. This select group of stations was recognized for exemplary broadcasting service to their local communities. For inclusion in this research, however, only 100,000 watt (Class C) stations licensed to public state colleges and universities were considered. A deliberate sample of 54 eligible stations was chosen first from listings in the CPB's Public Broadcasting Directory 1987-1988 and then verified secondly in the records of the Broadcasting/ Cablecasting Yearbook (1988).

By way of introduction, administrators of the 54 stations were contacted by mail, soliciting their participation in a telephone survey. Confirmation forms returned to the researcher indicated agreement to participate and supplied information regarding stations' contributing members and financial budgets. A written version of the telephone questionnaire was sent to participants for their advanced consideration of the topic. Approximate appointments were scheduled for calling during August and September, 1988.

Three groups of administrators (N=96) were personally interviewed by telephone. They included general/station managers, program directors, and development/promotion

directors. The telephone interviewing process consisted of a survey instrument that elicited reactions to the theoretically-derived, expert-verified positioning methods. The research tool was an adapted version of the initial written positioning questionnaire. The survey was devised to obtain data regarding administrators' perceptions of positioning as well as current practices in university-housed public radio stations.

Additionally, audience ratings of the stations were obtained from the Radio Research Consortium, Inc., for the purpose of comparison with administrators' positioning usage.

Quantitative data results from the two survey instruments and other records were analyzed in order to answer the research questions and hypotheses posed in the study. The statistical software package SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) was utilized to perform the necessary nonparametric and parametric procedures for analysis.

Definition of Terms

Affiliate. A radio station that broadcasts programming from a network.

AM. Abbreviation for amplitude modulation; a method of transmitting radio waves at certain frequencies, 535-1605 kilohertz; also called the standard broadcasting band; there are 107 channels in the AM band.

Broadcasting/Cablecasting Yearbook 1988. An annual reference directory of radio, television, and cable facilities, listing detailed information about stations; also includes ownership, network, programming, and equipment data.

Call Letters. The identifying characters of the alphabet assigned by the FCC to each radio station.

Commercial. Operated for financial profit; also, a radio announcement that advertises a product or service.

Coverage Area. The geographical region penetrable by a radio station's broadcast signal.

Cumulative Audience. The number of different persons served by a radio station's programming over a period of time, such as a week or a month.

Demographics. Descriptive information about audiences; statistics that divide the population in a market into groups, typically by age, sex, education, income.

Financial Funding. Monies from major sources including state and federal governments, academic institutions, subscribers, and business donors, that support the broadcasting functions of a radio station.

FM. Abbreviation for frequency modulation; a method of transmitting radio waves at certain frequencies, 88-108 megahertz; there are 100 channels in the FM band.

Format. The general type of programming presented by a

radio station, designed to appeal to a particular audience group.

Licensee. The individual, group, or organization authorized by the FCC to own and operate a radio station.

Logo. Abbreviation for logotype; the visual symbols and/or audio sounds used to identify a radio station.

Market. The total potential population served by a radio station in a specific geographic area.

Membership. Individuals who contribute annually a specified amount of money to a radio station, generally receiving gifts and/or communications in return, such as subscriptions to program guides.

Noncommercial. Not operated for financial profit; also refers to radio stations that broadcast no advertising.

Positioning. A marketing-based theory which involves making the consumer (audience) believe that one product or service (station) is really different from its competitors.

Psychographics. Descriptive information about audiences; statistics that divide the population in a market into groups; typically by lifestyles, attitudes, opinions, emotions, and/or behavioral patterns.

Public Radio. A federally-funded noncommercial radio service which broadcasts educational, informational, and cultural entertainment programming to local communities.

Rating. The percentage of the potential total audience

tuned to a specific program or radio station at a given time.

Reach. The number of individuals who listen to a specific commercial, program, or radio station at least once in a given time period.

Share. The percentage of the total listening audience tuned to a specific program or radio station at a given time; total shares in a given market area equal 100 percent.

Spot. A radio announcement; also, an advertisement for a product or service.

Station. A radio frequency licensed by the FCC to broadcast on a certain frequency; may be commercial or noncommercial; may or may not be part of a network.

Organization of Subsequent Chapters

The study is organized into five chapters. Chapter II provides a review of the related literature. The research methodology is described in Chapter III and includes an explanation of the study design, expert panel, research population and sample, as well as procedures for data collection and analysis. The results are presented in Chapter IV. Chapter V contains an interpretation of the findings, conclusions, recommendations, and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of related literature encompasses three distinct areas. The first section of this chapter is an overview of the late twentieth century media milieu, included to provide a frame of reference for understanding the nature of the research problem. The second section examines the evolution of public radio within the context of its relationship to American higher education, outlined to demonstrate the historic link between the two. Elucidation of market positioning theory can be found in the third section, intended to familiarize the reader with principles and concepts that are gaining attention and broader acceptance in the field of higher education administration.

The aim of this study was to test the applicability of a specific market positioning theory (Ries and Trout's theory) to a particular service function of and administrative unit within academia (public radio stations). Therefore, a synoptic view of the written works by Ries and Trout and explicit discussion of key ideas contained in their major book, Positioning: The Battle for Your Mind, are

included in this chapter as well. A summary is offered to recapitulate the scope of the literature presented herein.

The Media Milieu

The Electronic Communications Revolution

Channels of communication have changed immensely during the twentieth century. Most Americans today are becoming increasingly aware of the impact of mass media in shaping lifestyles and influencing decisions that touch all aspects of contemporary life. The media are often the focal point of much controversy, criticized by some and praised by others. Newspapers, magazines, paperback books, films, records, radio, and television are difficult to ignore and nearly impossible to escape because of their instant availability everywhere. Millions of people find these media to be stimulating and even irresistible. Messages received via media help us form images of reality. In the process of transmitting information, ideas, and attitudes to a large public audience, mass communicators have an ability to mold the actual destiny of civilization through their powers of interpretation and persuasion (Age, Ault, & Emery, 1979).

Americans of the 1980s live in an electronic environment. According to the Electronic Industries Association, consumers spent nearly 25 billion dollars in 1985 for electronic products ranging from portable audio systems to personal computers ("Slower But Steady," 1986).

In many homes, the traditional family room has developed into a media room or communicenter, complete with giant screen television, telephone, stereo, slide projector, citizen-band radio, video recorder, computer terminal, telex, and more (Kron, 1976; Stein, 1979; Williams, 1983). The communications revolution going on behind closed doors in American homes is making it easy for people to retreat into their own electronic island without stepping out the door (Ross, 1986). Gone is the familial hearth of yesteryear; folks now congregate around an "electronic fireplace" (Williams, 1983) for their information, entertainment, or distraction.

The explosion of new communications technologies makes person-to-person contact inessential, as words and pictures can now be bounced off space satellites and back to any place in the world in seconds. Time and distance being irrelevant, people around this shrinking globe are linked together in an impersonal and depersonalized way by modern mass media. Academician and communications scholar Frederic Williams (1983) summarized the situation as follows:

> When historians in a distant future century look back on the twentieth century, there are compelling reasons to believe that this era will mark another great transition in the evolution of our civilization. . . . The twentieth century marks the onset of the communications revolution. The human environment has been transformed by a panoply of electronic technologies. . . . We are well past the point of having the capability to transform most of human knowledge into electronic form for access at any point on the earth's surface. (pp. 200-201)

The Continuing Strength of Radio

The creation of music videos in recent years has not diminished the popularity of recorded music. Broadcast and cable television have not displaced motion pictures. The invention of radio did not make books and other printed material obsolete. People do not simply abandon one medium when another comes into vogue. Rather, audiences need and use them all, as interest in any one medium often stimulates attention to others (Head, 1972).

There is evidence that radio is alive and well and growing stronger than ever (Blume, 1983: Fornatale & Mills, 1980: Frazier, Gross, & Clay, 1977; Hedges, 1986; Landau, 1986; Radio Advertising Bureau, 1983; Williams, 1983). The total audience, number of stations, and gross revenue of the radio industry have increased every year since the early 1960s (Blume, 1983). During the period 1950 to 1970, the United States population increased 35 percent while the number of radio stations in the country increased 129 percent (Toffler, 1980). By 1988, there were more than 11,000 radio stations licensed by the Federal Communication Commission (By the numbers, 1988). Americans purchase 120,000 new radios a day (Hedges, 1986) and the average household contains more than five working sets (Frazier, et al., 1977). There are more than half a billion radios in use (Landau, 1986) by people as they listen while working, driving, walking, shopping, studying, eating, and doing

numerous other activities. A print advertisement by the Arbitron ratings company placed in trade journals boasted the following:

> It reaches beyond sight. Into imagination. 200 million listen every week. Three and a half hours every day. On the road, at work, on the jogging path, 96% of all Americans sing its tune, hear its message. That's the power of radio. (Arbitron, 1986, p. S-9)

Contributing to the significant growth of radio during the last three decades and continuing into the 1980s are the educational, noncommercial stations, which increased 2,292 percent between 1950 and 1981 (DeSonne, 1982). Recent figures reveal there are 1,339 educational FM stations broadcasting on the air, with another 297 new facilities in various stages of construction (By the numbers, 1988). These noncommercial stations are not operated for financial profit. The majority are licensed to colleges and universities, the balance to local school boards, municipalities, churches, religious organizations, and libraries (Fornatale & Mills, 1980).

Prior to 1967, "noncommercial" radio was referred to as "educational" radio. The most recently accepted generic word for it is "public" radio (Rowland, 1986). It is still customary to use these three terms interchangeably, however, and they will be exchanged throughout this discussion to suit the particular emphasis.

The De-Massified Audience

Throughout several decades of broadcast history, it was generally assumed that the recipients of mass communications were relatively large and undifferentiated numbers of people, receiving identical messages at the same time (Head, 1972). The mass media cut across all socioeconomic, demographic and lifestyle differences to reach for the common denominator in anonymous audiences. The popularity of network radio during the 1930s and 1940s, for example, was attributed to its wide appeal to the average American family. It was not until the 1960s that communications researchers began to identify dozens of distinct audiences among the various media (MacDonald, et al., 1980). Today it is nearly impossible to characterize a typical audience of any medium and the word "mass" is becoming obsolete. Futurist Alvin Toffler coined the term "de-massified media" (1980, p. 174) in reference to the plethora of newspapers, magazines, paperback books, films, records, radio, and television now aimed at specific segments of the populace. To mention but a few, there exist certain publications circulated for sports enthusiasts, movies produced particularly for teenagers, and music attuned to even the esoteric tastes.

Broadcasting, earlier defined bucolically as the literal act of scattering seeds of sound upon the landscape at random (Siemering, 1969), has been readjusted and fine

tuned into "narrowcasting"--usually a restricted type of programming appealing to a narrowly defined demographic audience (Eastman, Head, & Klein, 1982). Those engaged in the administration of radio in particular have experimented with numerous program formats to capture the attention of highly selective age, ethnic, and/or cultural groups (Johnson & Jones, 1978; Quaal & Brown, 1976).

The marketing objective of media management has evolved from striving to be all things to all people, into the precise targeting of much smaller groups. Catering to special interests by means of personalized service has become a standard ploy to build rather limited but loyal clientele in the 1980s.

The Relationship Between Public Radio and Higher Education

Historical Perspective

Roots of radio broadcasting in the United States can be traced to collegiate engineering and science laboratory experiments on the eve of the twentieth century (Barnouw, 1982; Frost, 1937a; Waller, 1946). Faculty and students at many midwestern land-grant universities tinkered with the technology of wireless communication for decades before administrators glimpsed its mass educational possibilities. While Professor Reginald Aubrey Fessenden was head of the electrical engineering school at Purdue University in 1892, he began research that resulted in the first long-distance

transmission of the human voice by wireless telephony in 1906 (Geddes, 1988). The capability of adding speech, and later music, in point-to-point communications sparked interest of those in other academic departments on campus who wanted access to this new electronic teaching device. Once the hardware had been invented and stations constructed, the novelty of radio subsided in the scientific segment of academe. Little consideration was given to the large potential audience beyond the educational community. Early use of radio was generally limited to in-house training and instructional purposes (Brant, 1981).

Experimental transmitter 9XM, developed by two physics professors at the University of Wisconsin, was the first full-time educational radio station, licensed by the Department of Commerce in 1915. Its call letters later became and remain WHA, which was always considered a leader in the field (Baudino & Kittross, 1977). More than a dozen other universities were also issued licenses before World War I. Some stations were even the products of senior theses.

Radio boomed in the 1920s as receivers became more available for purchase by the public. Dissemination of weather and agricultural reports gradually expanded into broadcasts from college classrooms, concert halls, and sporting events. "Several began to vision the microphone as a powerful new arm of the teacher, as a means for extending

his influence over wide areas far beyond the classroom and campus," wrote broadcast historian Frost (1937b, p. 216) in regard to the awakened interest in radio as an educational tool. By 1925 educational institutions had been granted 171 AM broadcasting licenses. However, most of these permits were short-lived and expired or were transferred to commercial interests in the early 1930s (Broadcasting/ Cablecasting Yearbook, 1988).

Economic factors contributed to the decline of many educational radio stations during the Great Depression period. Financial costs of station operation, hazy educational goals, laissez-faire governmental regulations, lack of powerful advocacy, and pressures from commercial broadcasters to give up their shared frequencies, all challenged the tenuous existence of campus stations (Lashner, 1976; Severin, 1978).

Although radio broadcasting in the U.S. originally began as a totally commercial-free concept (Barnouw, 1982; Head, 1972), venturous entrepreneurs found ways of making money from the airwaves. Toll broadcasting and program sponsorship emerged as means of offsetting production expenses and soon developed into overt advertising (Smith, 1979). Selling commercial time proved to be so financially profitable that successful broadcasting businessmen eyed the educational channels for easy take-over. University licensees were unprepared to meet the competition (Waller, 1946).

In an attempt to survive the encroachment of commercialism in the broadcasting industry, educators representing some campus radio facilities organized the Association of College and University Broadcasting Stations (ACUBS), which subsequently became the National Association of Educational Broadcasters (NAEB) in 1934. According to communications historian Sydney Head, this small group of pioneers met to discuss "monotonously consistent common problems: lack of money and lack of appreciation in the upper levels of the educational hierarchy" (1972, p. 210). The association's sincere but weak lobbying efforts failed to prevent federal regulatory authorities from squeezing educational stations out of the regular standard broadcasting band (AM) and into the high frequency spectrum (FM) where channels were unwanted by commercial enterprises (Nord, 1978).

The Role of the Federal Government

It was not until 1945 that the Federal Communications Commission finally took action on behalf of educational stations by reserving 20 of the 100 FM channels exclusively for noncommercial use (FCC, 1945). Among some of the first university-licensed FM stations were WILL of the University of Illinois and KSUI of the University of Iowa. Another boost for college radio came in 1948 when the FCC authorized low-power broadcasting, enabling schools to start up 10-watt stations for only a modest investment. Syracuse

University's WAER and DePauw University's WGRE were examples of some of the original low-power operations (Brant, 1981).

With encouragement from educational broadcasters and the endorsement of President Lyndon Johnson, the Carnegie Corporation formed a commission in 1965 to study noncommercial broadcasting and make recommendations for its future. The commission coined the term "public broadcasting" in order to disassociate from the stuffy image projected by traditionally dull educational broadcasting and to emphasize intentions of serving the general public at large (Carnegie Commission, 1967). While the Carnegie report focused entirely on television, it did provide Congress with a timely impetus for passage of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. Radio was included in the legislation only after strong persuasion by the director of NAEB's educational radio division (Gibson, 1977). This law created the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, a quasi-governmental nonprofit agency designed to receive and dispense funds for public broadcasting. Under the auspices of the CPB, National Public Radio was founded in 1970 to supply programming to member stations. Yet the origination of NPR has been characterized as "almost an afterthought" of politicians (Fornatale & Mills, 1980, p. 175).

The Carnegie Commission produced a second report in 1979--this time addressing radio, too--calling for increased federal support and expansion of the public broadcasting

system (Carnegie Commission, 1979; Gibson, 1977). Unfortunately for both public radio and higher education licensees, the Carnegie II recommendations were never introduced in Congress and had little impact during an era when federal spending was closely scrutinized. The dilemma of a permanent, long-range funding solution persisted into the 1980s (Rowland, 1986).

Congress created the Temporary Commission on Alternative Financing for Public Telecommunications in 1981 to explore funding options and to oversee an advertising experiment (TCAF, 1983). The Commission concluded that allowing limited advertising on public stations was risky but had no real detrimental effect. Recommendations included continuation of federal aid as well as stimulation of nonfederal revenue sources through enhanced underwriting acknowledgements, "to permit public broadcasters to identify supporters by using brand names, trade names, slogans, brief institutional-type messages, and public service announcements" (TCAF, 1983, p. iv). The subsequent relaxation of FCC policies regarding limited advertising contributed to a spiraling trend toward commercialization of the public broadcasting industry, as outlined prophetically by Dunagan (1983).

Administrators' Attitudes Toward Radio

While some administrators in higher education welcomed the radio phenomenon from the start as an instrument capable

of delivering an important service to their communities, interest was usually the exception and apathy the rule. The story at Columbia University during the formative years of educational radio was typical: A proposal for a radio station was rejected in 1920 by President Nicholas Murray Butler who reportedly told the requesting administrator, "Tyson, don't bother about that. There are gadgets turning up every week in this country, and this won't amount to anything" (Frost, 1937b, p. 219).

College administrators were slow to recognize the value of radio in an academic setting. Some educators used radio only as a promotional tool to publicize their institutions and hopefully pump up enrollment figures, especially in extension of home-study courses. The general public paid meager attention to such self-proclaimed encomia by school officials.

> It was difficult for some of the persons responsible for programming on the educational stations to realize that a station to be successful must actually render a service to the community in which it operates. More often they held to the thought that any program service should promote first, little thinking that unless a program can stimulate interest, it cannot promote. (Waller, 1946, p. 400)

Where broadcast operations were housed on campus, i.e., within administrative jurisdiction of academic departments or other divisions, was a reflection of top management's commitment and support for its station. University structure and governance was also reflected in a station's ability to execute its functions with quality and responsive

programming. "Ideally . . . the general manager of a university station would serve as a vice-president of the university at the same level as vice presidents for academic or financial affairs," advised one public broadcasting professional (Ozier, 1978, p. 34). Placement of station management any lower in the organizational chart invited superiors to administer the broadcast operation as just part of some other activities.

Since their inception, collegiate radio stations were susceptible to manipulation by administrators to suit personal needs and tastes rather than those of the audience (Lucoff, 1979). Nevertheless, university management had a legal and ethical obligation to ensure that its broadcasting operated in the interest, convenience, and necessity of the general public, not simply for benefit of the university or its personnel. The Editorial Integrity Project (1986) reminded educators repeatedly that a university might possess the broadcast permit, "but that institution holds the license in trust for the public and on behalf of the public. Public broadcasting stations are required to serve the public, not those who hold their licenses" (p. iii).

In all too many institutions, public radio was viewed as a pleasant frill, "incapable of serious academic contribution" (Siemering, 1969, p. 66). Administrators who treated radio with indifference or lukewarm concern caused the university's failure to fulfill its responsibilities as

an FCC licensee. Those in the upper eschelons of administration who acknowledged the role their radio outlet could play in furthering institutional goals tended to enhance the station with adequate fiscal support and other resources necessary to provide a meaningful service.

> Good administration in any field requires clear and open lines of communication and understanding between the top-level decision makers and the group in charge of day-to-day operations. It was no surprise, therefore, to discover that the significance of a public radio station's service in its community is directly proportional to the degree of understanding and support it receives from the top administrators of its licensee institution. (Robertson & Yokom, 1973, p. 110)

Status of University-Licensed Radio in the 1980s

No uniform description has adequately captured the essence of university-licensed public radio. Basically a local medium (Josephson, 1979), public stations have mirrored the diversity of institutions and communities in which they serve.

Although radio has played a diminished role in higher education since its pre-emption by television (Eastman et al., 1985), public radio stations on campus generally have matured and became more professional during the 1980s.

Leidman's 1985 survey of 243 college and university-affiliated stations revealed four predominant missions or operating philosophies: to provide community service, student training, alternative programming, and a professional sound. Furthermore, lack of commitment and

understanding of broadcast needs by institutional licensees were apparent in that particular national station sample.

Brant (1981) pointed out that instructional programs declined over the years and were replaced by entertainment, news, and public affairs programming. Leidman (1985) discovered that while jazz and fine arts remained the musical mainstay of college stations, an upsurgence of progressive rock was also evident. University of Missouri's KBIA-FM was one of the premier stations in 1988 to experiment with New Age and Space Music programming.

Station WHUR-FM of Howard University in Washington, DC, was the first college-operated radio outlet in a major market to achieve a first-place standing in the Arbitron ratings (Evans, 1986). Other university stations had surprising impact on local retail record sales due to their airplay (Gold, 1982). In fact, most collegiate broadcasting succeeded primarily in the area of music programming.

As a group, the deficiency noted a decade ago has also characterized educational stations through the 1980s: "The least successful aspect has been their failure to extend the knowledge available in our educational institutions to the public" (Johnson & Jones, 1978, p. 135).

Market Positioning Theory

Theorists Ries and Trout

Al Ries and Jack Trout were both alumni of the advertising and sales department at General Electric

Company. Ries went on to become an account supervisor at Needham, Louis, Brorby, and Marsteller, Inc., while Trout was a divisional ad manager for Uniroyal, Inc. The Ries Cappiello Colwell advertising agency was founded in 1963, with Al Ries as president and Jack Trout as vice president and director of marketing services (Trout & Ries, 1972a). Known as "the positioning agency," some of their clients included Baldwin Pianos, Dun's Review, Sony of America, and Western Union (Dougherty, 1975). Ries Cappiello Colwell also gained notoriety in the mid-1970s for serving free lunches to employees at a time when other businesses were experiencing economic retrenchment (Grozon, 1975). Trout and Ries, Inc. was created as a separate entity in 1979, with Ries appointed as chairman and Trout president of the New York-based company. Their advertising client list contained such familiar organizations as Digital Equipment Company, McGraw-Hill, Monsanto, NBC-FM Radio Group, Radio Advertising Bureau, Sterling Optical, and the Xerox Corporation (Standard Directory of Advertising Agencies, 1986).

Jack Trout published his first article about positioning in 1969, predicting a forthcoming era in the communications and marketing business that would place emphasis not only on product features and corporate image, but more importantly, on establishing a "position" in the minds of prospective customers. Trout explained how too

many similar products ("me-too" products), plus the overabundance of marketing messages were causing consumer confusion. He advised top management of organizations to evaluate objectively their offerings from the customers' points of view and relate to what was already in their prospects' minds, i.e., take advantage of positions already owned. Strong positioning programs were cumulative in nature, he stressed, flexible yet consistent (Trout, 1969).

In a follow-up article, Trout (1971) chastised his former employer, General Electric (G.E.), for violating rules of the positioning game by venturing into the computer business with intentions of dislodging the market leader, IBM Corporation. As Trout foresaw, attempts at head-on competition proved futile for both G.E. and RCA since neither company built a new computer position based on their well-known business strengths.

A three-part series of articles in Advertising Age (1972a, b, c) moved the positioning topic into the limelight of discussion within the marketing community and anointed Al Ries and Jack Trout as gurus of positioning. In their first published collaboration, Trout and Ries traced the evolution of market positioning from various advertising cycles. The 1950s product era, when hard-sell ads predominated, was followed by the 1960s image phase, when creativity came into vogue. The 1970s ushered in the positioning era, "where strategy is king" (1972a, p. 35).

> Yesterday, positioning was used in a narrow sense to mean what the advertiser did to his product. Today, positioning is used in a broader sense to mean what the advertiser does for the product in the prospect's mind. In other words, a successful advertiser today uses advertising to position his product, not to communicate its advantages or features. (Trout & Ries, 1972a, p. 35)

Positioning was touted as a way to ensure communications will be heard in a media-saturated society overexposed to advertising noise. Astute pseudo-psychologists, Ries and Trout based their theory on the human tendency to rank nearly everything on mental ladders, as well as the filtration process of coping with complexity by reducing information to its simplest elements. "Make no mistake about it, the mind is the battleground," they declared (Trout & Ries, 1972a, p. 38).

The second article in the frequently cited series illustrated several positioning strategies that worked well for the automobile, packaged goods, beverage, media, and airline industries, by linking brands to prospects' entrenched perceptions. Trout and Ries (1972b) pointed out the importance of a good name, warned against product line extensions, and recommended unhesitatingly naming competitors.

Part three of the published trilogy dealt with strategical thinking. Ries and Trout said that leadership positions were not the result of marketing skill or product innovations, but were built by "seizing the initiative . . . while the situation was still fluid" (Trout & Ries, 1972c,

p. 114). They offered strategic advice to both leaders and nonleaders on how to enhance their positions in the marketplace. Leaders are benefited, they said, by extolling the value of their generic product category, while nonleaders should position as an alternative to the leader. Six questions were also presented for consideration by those embarking upon a positioning program:

1. What position do you already own in the prospect's mind?
2. What position would you like to own?
3. Whom must you outgun to establish the position?
4. Do you have enough money to achieve and hold the position?
5. Are you prepared to stick with one consistent positioning concept?
6. Does your creative approach match your positioning strategy? (Trout & Ries, 1972c, p. 116)

Ries and Trout's positioning theory was panegyrized by many marketing professionals in the years following their famed explication in the pages of Advertising Age. They were besieged with requests for reprints of the articles and for speaking engagements worldwide. Jack Trout even joined the academic ranks briefly to teach a college course on the subject of positioning at New York University during the 1974-75 school year (Dougherty, 1975). Al Ries wrote prolifically through the decade (Geltzer & Ries, 1975; Ries,

1974a, 1974b, 1977), including a treatise aimed at college admissions officers outlining requirements of successful institutional positioning strategy--market research, timing, objectivity, and consistency (Geltzer & Ries, 1976).

Not all were enamored with the controversial positioning doctrine. Abrams (1972), Crain (1973), Greenland (1972), McCall (1973), and Springer (1972), for example, challenged Ries and Trout's preoccupation with strategy at the expense of people, creativity, and distribution channels. However, none of these critics seriously disputed the basic tenets of the theory (Positioning "positioning," 1972).

Ten years after coining the positioning buzzword, Ries and Trout paid homage to the concept with a "birthday" party at the posh 21 Club in New York City, where Ries was quoted as asking the rhetorical question, "If we're so smart, why aren't we rich?" (Trout & Ries take position, 1979, p. D11)

To chart the status of positioning a decade after its inception, Trout and Ries prepared a follow-up article in 1979 and deduced that "in the communication jungle out there, the only hope to score big is to be selective, to concentrate on narrow targets, to practice segmentation" (p. 32). They found that positioning was still an effective practice in the contemporary marketplace. Additionally, the positionists were even more emphatic about the need for a competitor orientation, which had been devalued historically

by marketing experts solely in favor of the customer orientation. In order to succeed in the 1980s, they prophesied, a company should "look for weak points in the positions of its competitors and then launch marketing attacks against those weak points" (Trout & Ries, 1979, p. 42).

Jack Trout lectured at a national convention of radio programmers in 1981, addressing broadcasting problems such as station proliferation, format copying, and AM decline. He advised radio executives to nail down a clear identity, make bold moves when necessary, and quickly block competitors' actions. Furthermore, Trout counseled AM broadcasters to maintain their forte in news/information services rather than attempt to recapture music listeners (Tricks, 1981, p. 28).

Also printed the same year was Ries and Trout's major book, Positioning: The Battle for Your Mind (1981), which elaborated upon many of the ideas originally put forth in their journal articles. The recurrence of six general positioning themes was ostensive throughout the work--customer focus, competitor focus, market niche, consistency, simplicity, and commitment.

Customer Focus. According to Ries and Trout, the genesis of a successful positioning campaign was to focus on the prospective customers or clients, starting with investigation of the present marketplace mentality. The

purpose was to discover what images of one's product or service had already been formulated, i.e., to determine what currently exists in the prospects' minds. Research efforts were encouraged in order to detect prevailing attitudes and opinions of the target consumers. Ries and Trout acknowledged that a customer's perception is the only true reality in a marketing communications situation. They also distinguished between inside-out thinking and outside-in thinking. "To find a unique position, you must ignore conventional logic. Conventional logic says you find your concept inside yourself or inside the product. Not true. What you must do is look inside the prospect's mind," wrote the authorities (Ries & Trout, 1981, p. 40). One approach they suggested to mapping the minds of prospective customers was use of semantic differential, a research technique based on ranking competitors' attributes for comparative purposes.

Competitor Focus. Ries and Trout depicted the problem in most marketing situations as mainly one of "coming to grips with the competition" (1981, p. 223). They stressed the importance of identifying competitors, analyzing their strengths and weaknesses, and examining prospects' thoughts regarding these rivals. Consideration of market scenarios from competitors' viewpoints as well as one's own was also highly recommended by the positioning doctrinaires. Ries and Trout praised the classic 1960s Avis rent-a-car advertising campaign--"we try harder" (1981, p. 38)--as a

prime example of sagacious maneuvering in relation to a competitor. Since Hertz was recognized as the market leader at the time, Avis managed to establish a second place position by relating itself to its number one competitor, they construed, not from actually trying harder!

Market Niche. A vital part of management planning and decision-making, according to Ries and Trout, involves the determination of efficacious market positions to be achieved and maintained while confronting threats of competition and/or imitation. They claimed that the strongest positions in the mind are those which were established first, usually by serving the unmet needs of some distinct consumer segment. Ries and Trout declared the first person, first service, or first product to capture prospects' attention had strategic advantage over "also-rans," i.e. followers, in most any field. Examples they listed included such corporate prominence as Kodak in photography, IBM in computers, Xerox in paper copiers, and Coca-Cola in soft drinks.

> The essential ingredient in securing the leadership position is getting into the mind first. The essential ingredient in keeping that position is reinforcing the original concept. The standard by which all others are judged. In contrast, everything else is an imitation of "the real thing." (Ries & Trout, 1981, p. 56)

If one cannot find a way to be first in their particular product category, then Ries and Trout suggested that management "cherchez le creneau" (look for the hole) and fill it (p. 66). Marketing creneaux might be created on the

basis of product size, price, usage, consumer characteristics, or distribution avenues. For instance, Volkswagen's "think small" slogan and 7-Up's "uncola" alternative identification were cited by the positioners as representing such market niche strategies (Ries & Trout, 1981, p. 40, 67).

Consistency. Once the basic positioning concept of a product or service has been decided by management, Ries and Trout recommended that all other elements of the positioning program be carefully developed around the central theme. Everything should match the intended position, they claimed--the product itself, name, advertising copy, promotional activities associated with it--and serve to reinforce the original concept. "More than anything else, successful positioning requires consistency. You must keep at it year after year," the experts advised (1981, p. 40). Ries and Trout lamented the fact that executives who have led winning positioning campaigns often stumble into a trap of forgetting what made them successful, thus failing to appreciate positions firmly established and changing strategies unnecessarily. The effectiveness and credibility of the Avis rent-a-car positioning campaign mentioned above, for example, was subsequently eroded by mistaken "brag-and-boast advertising" (Ries & Trout, 1981, p. 41) of the company's later aspirations to be number one rather than two on the consumer product ladder.

Simplicity. "Experience has shown that a positioning exercise is a search for the obvious. Those are the easiest concepts to communicate because they make the most sense to the recipient of a message," Ries and Trout explained (1981, p. 204). However, simple ideas are often hard to accept, due to a human tendency to marvel at complexity and snub the facile. The positioning masters warned management to be leery of complicated or clever ideas as probably being too obscure to implement in an overcommunicated society. Unembellished messages, purified of cryptic copy, can produce a striking impact, notwithstanding the nearly deafening volume of media chatter featured in contemporary American life. In the transmittance of communications, Ries and Trout averred, more is actually less and vice versa.

> One of the great communication tragedies is to watch an organization go through a careful planning exercise, step by step, complete with charts and graphs and then turn the strategy over to the "creatives" for execution. They, in turn, apply their skills and the strategy disappears in a cloud of technique, never to be recognized again. (Ries & Trout, 1981, p. 225)

The positioning doctrinaires suggested sometimes advertising the unadorned marketing strategy alone, in lieu of expressions shrouded with ingenuity.

Commitment. Positioning is a cumulative process and therefore demands an extensive long-term commitment by management. "Winning the mind . . . is a lot like waging a war. Everyone in the army, from the top down, must agree on what the objective is," wrote Ries and Trout (1981, p. 178)

in regard to essential support from the entire organization. Their positioning guidance included determining a basic strategy and remaining with it, permitting modifications in the short-term tactics only. Ries and Trout counseled leaders to set corporate positioning goals five to ten years into the future. It also takes a substantial amount of financial capital to drive a message into prospects' minds, they insisted, since the modern market environment clamors with incessant advertising noise relative to new products and services. The positionists exhorted the allocation of ample monetary resources in order to build, establish, and hold a chosen position. Although change is unavoidably characteristic of the late twentieth century marketing scene, its accompanying instability can be detrimental to effective positioning. Ries and Trout's remedy to cope with the rapid pace of change was managerial instruction to keep doing what one does best. To illustrate the endurance of successful positioning formulas, Ries and Trout pointed to evidence such as Marlboro cowboys riding into the sunset through many years, Crest toothpaste fighting the cavities of a second generation, and Avon calling for decades.

The tone of Al Ries and Jack Trout's theorizing became increasingly couched in militaristic language and connotations reminiscent of battle at the front of a firing line. Their fascination with military strategy culminated in the publication of Marketing Warfare (1986), a book

dedicated to a nineteenth century Prussian general whom they admired as being a brilliant marketing strategist. Based on the premise that modern marketing has become a life-or-death conflict, Ries and Trout outlined principles of defensive, offensive, flanking, and guerrilla warfare suitable for corporate emulation. They declared that "the true nature of marketing today is not serving the customer; it is outwitting, outflanking, outfighting your competitors. In short, marketing is war where the enemy is the competition and the customer is the ground to be won" (Ries and Trout, 1986, p. vi). Anyone reluctant to arm themselves with the strategical forces led by Ries and Trout's combat rules might be severely disadvantaged on the marketing battlefield which has already exploded and will only intensify in the near future.

Summary

The preceding review of related literature served to document the interdisciplinary undertones pertaining to the research problem of this study. The media milieu in which university-licensed public radio stations operate was described in terms of an accelerating electronic communications revolution, including a radio medium narrowcasting to audiences no longer en masse. The evolution of public radio was unfolded with acknowledgement of its educational roots, federal impetus, academic administrators' perceptions and involvement, plus a status

report of collegiate stations in the 1980s. Delineation of Ries and Trout's market positioning theory was included to provide a reference guide for those in higher education administration who may be receptive to innovative philosophies potentially applicable to academe.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

An overview of the research methodology was presented in Chapter I. This chapter describes specific procedures employed to address the research problem pertaining to the utility of Ries and Trout's market positioning theory for university administrators who operate public radio stations. The following subtopics are detailed herein: design of the study, expert panel selection, research population, sample selection, instrumentation, data collection, analysis of the data, and summary.

Design of the Study

The study was classified as ex post facto, a design used frequently in research related to education (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). The researcher was not able to manipulate deliberately or to control the variables under investigation due to pre-existing conditions. In this situation, it was justifiable to obtain information in retrospect and to look for possible relationships between independent and dependent variables. While cause-and-effect conclusions were not

appropriate from this type of design, comparisons and correlations may be suggested (McMillan & Schumacher, 1984).

Expert Panel Selection

A panel of experts was consulted for the purpose of judging the importance and usefulness of Ries and Trout's theoretical market positioning principles for administrators of public radio stations. The panel consisted of 14 of the 26 members of the Board of Directors of National Public Radio and American Public Radio (Appendix B). These two networks produce the majority of programming that university-licensed public radio stations broadcast daily. The distinguished Board members have specific expertise in the field of public broadcasting management. The fundamental reason for selecting the NPR and APR leadership to comprise the expert panel for this study, therefore, was their positions of authority to guide and influence the product which stations must subsequently position in the marketplace.

Research Population

The research population consisted of 171 university-licensed public radio stations located throughout the United States that were identified as being "CPB-qualified." The Corporation for Public Broadcasting, as noted in Chapter II, functions specifically by federal law to receive and dispense funds for public broadcasting. The Corporation has

designated strict criteria--covering areas of facilities, personnel, programming quality, budget, on-air time, and more--that must be met in order to qualify for financial support. Institutions holding the broadcasting license and housing the stations are comprised of public, private, religious, technical, two-year and four-year colleges and universities. While other noncommercial licensee types, such as local and state, are also eligible for CPB qualification, the majority are institutions of higher education. Considering there are 1339 noncommercial educational radio stations currently on the airwaves (By the numbers, 1988), those receiving CPB recognition (171) are indeed an elite group.

Sample Selection

A subset of the research population was of particular interest for this study. According to Fox (1969), the only way to assure that specific elements of the population are included in the sample is to use a process of deliberate selection. In this case, the sample was confined to CPB-qualified public radio stations classified by the FCC as Class C (maximum power 100,000 watts) FM facilities licensed to public state colleges and universities. Fifty-six stations met this criterion for inclusion in the sample, but two were used in a pretest experiment, leaving a final sample size of 54 for the main study.

The rationale for directly choosing this sample was that the subject of market positioning is a relatively new frontier for serious consideration in university-licensed public radio. Therefore, in light of the exploratory nature of the topic, it seemed logical to investigate initially those stations run by well-established institutions which were considered the most sophisticated--as evidenced by meeting the rigorous CPB standards--and powerful in terms of having potential to reach the largest audiences.

Three groups of administrators representing the 54 stations were invited to participate in the study. They held titles and were accountable for duties as follows: (1) General or Station Managers, who were basically the formulators of the stations' positioning strategies, (2) Program Directors, who developed the product and implemented tactics to carry out the strategies, and (3) Development or Promotion Directors, who were responsible for communicating the stations' position to prospects. The reason for selecting these groups was an assumption that basic understanding of and receptivity to market positioning by these particular administrators may determine the impact of their stations in the marketplace.

The administrators were identified first from listings in the CPB's Public Broadcasting Directory 1987-1988 and then verified in the Broadcasting/Cablecasting Yearbook (1988). A total of 96 administrators participated in the

research--32 from each administrative group--representing 45 stations in the sample (Appendix I).

Instrumentation

Instrument Design

Two separate research instruments were administered during the course of the study. The first instrument was designed in a written format (see Appendix D) for review by the panel of experts regarding the import and usage of market positioning strategies and tactics in public radio. A primary purpose of the instrument was to verify the potential applicability of Ries and Trout's theoretical propositions derived from the literature. Panel validation served to establish standards for subsequent evaluation and analysis of station administrators' perceptions and positioning practices. The second instrument was designed as a telephone survey (see Appendix G) used to facilitate the data collection of opinions from administrators of the university-licensed public radio stations in the sample.

Professional survey designers contend there are usually no differences in answers to questions administered by telephone, mail, or in person (Sudman & Bradburn, 1982). Considering the evidence of increasing resistance to personal interviewing (Blankenship, 1977), it was determined that a combination of written and telephone survey methods would be most reliable and practical for acquiring the necessary research data. The mailed questionnaire proved to

be an effective approach for reaching the expert panel, offering them privacy and convenience in replying. The telephone survey was an ideal technique for communicating with the dispersed sample of station administrators within a relatively short time period.

Advantages of using the telephone for research include high response rate, interviewer control, greater cooperation, flexibility, enhanced data quality, efficiency, frankness in response, ability to probe, and reduced data retrieval time (Blankenship, 1977; Frey, 1983; McMillan & Schumacher, 1984). It was also deemed an appropriate data-gathering device for this research project because one of the first telephone surveys conducted in 1929 by renowned pollster Dr. George Gallup, then affiliated with Drake University, was a study of radio listenership (Blankenship, 1977).

Instrument Development

The two researcher-developed survey instruments were based on the market positioning principles theorized by Ries and Trout (1981, 1986; Trout, 1969, 1971; Trout & Ries, 1972 a, b, c; 1979), as identified in the literature review. A search of several data bases--including the Business Index, Business Periodicals Index, BRS, DATRIX, DIALOG, ERIC, and RLIN--was undertaken to examine a broad cross section of writing and research about positioning in a variety of fields. Scrutiny of these sources disclosed Ries and Trout

as the dominant authorities, their positioning theory providing an appropriate framework within which major recurring themes in the literature may be organized.

The survey instruments were built around the following six general positioning ideas, extrapolated from the Ries and Trout works listed above: Audience Focus, Competition Focus, Market Niche, Consistency, Simplicity, and Commitment. The instruments consisted of strategies and tactics stemming from these principles and presented in the form of statements. Ries and Trout's propositions were modified only where it was determined that slight changes in expression would make the statements more relevant to the media/academic environment.

A description of the purpose and stages of development for each section of the written instrument is provided below. The telephone survey was composed of identical statements, minus those judged unimportant by the expert panel.

Audience Focus. The first section of the instrument, containing seven statements, was developed with emphasis on the prospective listeners. Ries and Trout (1981) encouraged those embarking upon a positioning program to start with an investigation of current status in the mentality of the marketplace. The purpose is to determine what already exists in prospects' minds, i.e., what images and perceptions of the product/service are entrenched at

present. Explicit in this focus is the need for research to uncover the opinions and attitudes of those one wishes to target. The genesis of a successful positioning campaign was outlined in the following strategy and accompanying tactics.

Strategy: 1. Focus on the audience.

Tactics: 1A. Conduct qualitative research of audience perceptions and opinions of the station.

1B. Direct the programming to a narrow target audience.

1C. Identify what listeners believe are strengths of the station.

1D. Identify what listeners believe are weaknesses of the station.

1E. Determine how listeners rank one's station in comparison to others.

1F. Relate programming to something the audience is familiar with.

Competition Focus. The second section of the instrument, containing six items, pertained to opponents. Ries and Trout (1981) advised managers to devote as much attention to examining the market situation from competitors' points of view as from their own. After defining who the rivals are, this involves thorough consideration of their strengths and weaknesses in relation

to one's own. This was covered by the following strategy and tactics.

Strategy: 2. Focus on the competition.

Tactics: 2A. Evaluate strengths of competing stations.

2B. Evaluate weaknesses of competing stations.

2C. Exploit weaknesses of competing stations.

2D. Avoid direct competition with the market leader.

2E. Refer to other stations by name in one's own promos and advertising.

Market Niche. The third section of the instrument, containing five statements, involved decisions regarding the best possible position to occupy and defend against assault by competitors or imitators. According to Ries and Trout (1981), those who are successful at establishing strong positions in the mind usually do so by being first to provide unique products/services that benefit targeted groups of prospects, avoiding fads and images that are too broad. The following strategy and tactics evolved from such considerations.

Strategy: 3. Find a market niche to fill.

Tactics: 3A. Be first in the market to program a particular format.

3B. Fill a hole in the market by offering alternative programming.

3C. Create a new market niche based on audience lifestyle preferences.

3D. Associate one's programming with the market leader.

Consistency. The fourth section of the instrument, containing five items, was developed to address the notion of congruence. Ries and Trout (1981) reminded administrators that positioning objectives must permeate and be reflected in one's entire operation, all elements matching the intended position. The following strategy and tactics were structured around this premise.

Strategy: 4. Require consistency throughout the entire positioning plan.

Tactics: 4A. Select station name and slogans that accurately describe the programming format.

4B. Develop advertising and promotional campaigns that match the intended position.

4C. Assure positioning objectives set the direction for all station activities.

4D. Reinforce position by use of repetition.

Simplicity. The fifth section of the instrument, containing four statements, emerged from the idea that less is more. Since overcommunication can be detrimental to effective positioning, Ries and Trout (1981) recommended the use of pure, unembellished messages that are easy to

remember. The following strategy and tactics were formulated to combat confusion.

Strategy: 5. Strive for simplicity in all communications.

Tactics: 5A. Use obvious ideas and simple words in a straightforward manner.

5B. Modify complex messages by restraining creative techniques.

5C. Oversimplify messages in order to make long-lasting impressions.

Commitment. The sixth and final section of the instrument, containing five items, involved planning and longevity. Ries and Trout (1981) urged managers to realistically contemplate long-range goals and means to achieve them. As a cumulative process, positioning demands trust in a basic formula and adequate time to witness results. The last strategy and tactics were suggested from this theme.

Strategy: 6. Establish long-term commitment to the positioning objective.

Tactics: 6A. Determine a basic position and adhere to it, changing only the short-term tactics.

6B. Decide long-range (5-10 year) positioning goals.

6C. Allocate a sufficiently large budget for advertising and promotional activities.

6D. Enlist support and understanding of entire station staff in promoting positioning goals.

Rating Scale

A major consideration in developing the written and telephone survey tools was that both instruments yield data amenable to computer analysis. This was accomplished by use of a rating scale that forced highly structured responses to items. Participants rated the degree of importance for each of the positioning statements on a five-point Likert scale. The rating scale provided was

5 = EXTREMELY IMPORTANT

4 = ABOVE AVERAGE IMPORTANCE

3 = AVERAGE IMPORTANCE

2 = BELOW AVERAGE IMPORTANCE

1 = NOT IMPORTANT

Respondents were also asked to answer "YES" or "NO" in regard to usage of each positioning strategy and tactic, based on their particular experience.

Pilot Test

Validity of the theoretical market positioning strategies and tactics was established through the written survey completed by the panel of experts in public broadcasting management. Administration of the written instrument also served as a preliminary test of the

positioning definition and items in terms of the appropriateness of the rating scale, significance of items, word usage, and style. Responses from the expert panel were considered in the modification and adaptation of the positioning statements for use on the telephone questionnaire. Some technical alterations were suggested and incorporated into the second research instrument.

A pilot test of the telephone instrument was conducted with the assistance of public radio administrators from six university-licensed stations similar to the projected survey sample. This pilot group included station managers, program directors, and development directors representing the following organizations:

WBHM-FM University of Alabama, Birmingham
KASU-FM Arkansas State University
WFSU-FM Florida State University
WWNO-FM University of New Orleans
WNIL-FM Northern Illinois University
WSFP-FM University of South Florida, Fort Myers

The participants completed the survey by telephone, requiring an average time of approximately fourteen minutes per call. Administrators' comments were also elicited regarding the format, clarity, ease of response, time factors, and suggestions for improvement of the instrument.

The pilot exercise revealed market positioning as a topic truly germane to the management of public radio

stations on college campuses. All of the administrators tested exhibited recent familiarity with the subject of positioning, and a majority expressed enthusiastic interest in discussing its theory and practice. Those who reviewed the instrument indicated that it was straightforward, nonthreatening, and easy to understand. The telephone interview format was not only acceptable to the pilot group, but unanimously preferred over other research methods.

Data Collection

The written survey instrument was mailed to the panel of experts in June 1988. Included in the mailing was a cover letter (Appendix C) and postage-paid reply envelope. Respondents were not asked to identify themselves by name since answers were combined with others for general analysis and anonymity was assured. Surveys were coded by the researcher, however, for the purpose of showing which experts did participate (Appendix B). Within three weeks, 17 of the 26 individuals had responded to the questionnaire, a return rate of 65%. Quantifiable data were extracted from fourteen usable surveys received.

All general/station managers, program directors, and development/promotion directors at the 54 sample stations were initially contacted by mail, in order to reduce the element of surprise associated with unanticipated telephone calls requiring interactional obligations (Frey, 1983). The introductory letter explicated the scope of the research

and solicited their participation in the study (Appendix E). If they agreed to be interviewed, a confirmation form was returned to the researcher with an appointment date specified (Appendix F). Prior to the interviews, each participant received a written copy of the survey for advanced consideration (Appendix G). This procedure is widely used in interviewing organizational respondents, allowing them time to prepare information and become comfortable with the subject matter (Sudman & Bradburn, 1982).

The data were collected over a span of fifteen days in August and September 1988, through telephone contact by the researcher. Calling dates were initially scheduled for August 17-24, but several follow-ups necessitated the extension of the phoning period into September in order to reach all participants. When contacted at their appointed times, respondents were again reminded of the research purpose and provided a working definition of positioning for the study (Appendix H). As intended in a structured format design, questions comprising the testing instrument were asked in sequence.

Additional information essential to the study--audience ratings, stations' membership and budget figures--was collected from two sources. The audience ratings were supplied by the Radio Research Consortium, Inc., based on results of an Arbitron survey taken during Spring 1988.

The membership and financial data were reported by station representatives on their survey confirmation forms (Appendix F).

Data Analysis

Statistical Procedures

Implementation of the two survey instruments, plus compilation of records from other sources noted above, produced quantitative data conducive to computer analysis by the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences program. Since the data collected ranged from nominal to ratio measurement scale types, the utilization of both nonparametric and parametric statistical procedures was appropriate.

Attention was directed first to the descriptive statistics generated from the written survey, since validation of the theoretical positioning statements by the expert panel was crucial to the foundation of the study as well as determining the makeup of the second research instrument. Item analysis included frequency distributions and measures of central tendency for each strategy and tactic.

Prior to implementation of the written survey instrument, criteria were established by the researcher regarding acceptance or rejection of the theoretical positioning statements as valid for further consideration in public radio and for inclusion in the second testing

instrument. Standards used were based on achieving a majority of the number of respondents to each item on the survey, rating a 3 (above average importance) or higher on the import scale. Another decision rule involved preference for the group median, rather than the mean, as representative of the typical import score on each item. There is evidence to suggest that the arithmetic mean can be adversely influenced by extreme scores in the collection, particularly when the sample size is small. The median is useful when a distribution is skewed or lacks symmetry, and provides a more accurate picture of the data set (Johnson, 1977; McMillan & Schumacher, 1984; Roscoe, 1975; Sax, 1974).

Each of the seven hypotheses presented in Chapter I was evaluated separately by executing one of the following techniques.

Chi-Square Test of Independence. This nonparametric procedure is commonly used to test for differences between categorical variables measured on nominal and/or higher scales (Fox, 1969). The data may be displayed in the form of contingency tables of various dimensions. Crosstabulation of the row and column variables is performed to test if they are independent of each other, based on comparison of observed and expected frequencies. Calculations deduced by the test include chi-square values, degrees of freedom, and associated significance levels (Mendenhall, Ott, & Larson, 1974). Small expected cell

frequencies of less than five necessitate conservative interpretation of the resulting statistics (Roscoe, 1975). The chi-square test alone provides little information about the strength of the relationship between the variables in question.

Cramer's V Correlation Coefficient (V). Since chi-square statistics test independence but not the degree of association between variables, other measures should be investigated for that purpose in order to make full use of the data. Cramer's V is a modification of and improvement over the traditional contingency coefficient, a limited relationship estimate. Based on the chi-square, this variant attempts to minimize the influence of small sample size and degrees of freedom, producing values that range from zero to one. The higher the coefficient, the stronger the association (Games & Klare, 1967). The statistic is computed by dividing the observed chi-square by the product of sample size multiplied by the number of table rows or columns (whichever is smaller) minus one, and taking the square root of the result (Norusis, 1986). Statistical significance is determined by the significance of its associated chi-square value. Cramer's V is considered more reliable and superior to the contingency coefficient as an index of relationship (Champion, 1981; Roscoe, 1975).

The chi-square test of independence and affiliated Cramer's V coefficient were selected for answering only the

first hypothesis in this study because the small sample size (N=14) precluded the use of a stronger parametric procedure.

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The ANOVA is a widely accepted and powerful method of parametric testing for two or more group mean score differences. The one-way procedure can be applied when there is only a single independent variable (Wiersma, 1986). It compares variance between groups to the variance within each group. Estimates of variance are expressed as mean squares. These are put into ratio form, the resulting F-ratio calculated as the variance between divided by variance within. An associated significance level is also computed (Mendenhall, et al., 1974).

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r). The Pearson r is a popular parametric statistical measure of relationship between two continuous data variables. It is often used to study how a change in one variable may tend to be related to a change in another variable. Data are paired, i.e., an observation of one variable is paired with an observation of a second variable for each subject under study. The resulting r value and an associated significance level assesses both the direction (+ or direct; - or inverse) and the strength (between 0 and 1.00) of the relationship between two variables. The significance of the correlation coefficient is a function of sample size (Roscoe, 1975).

Multiple Regression. This is a sophisticated multivariate statistical technique used to study relationships between one dependent measure and two or more independent measures. Regression analysis is concerned with prediction, trying to estimate a Y-labeled score from a knowledge of several X-labeled scores. Predicted values tend to regress toward the mean of the population (Wiersma, 1986).

A statistical equation provides information about the contribution that the predictor variables make--separately and combined--to the criterion variable. The multiple correlation coefficient (R), expressed in values from zero to one, shows correlation between actual values of the Y variable and Y values estimated by the multiple regression equation. How well one can predict variance in the dependent variable from the independent variables used in the equation is revealed by R squared (Johnson, 1977).

Multiple regression coefficients may not be directly comparable if the independent variables differ in units of measurement. One way to compensate for this inequality is to calculate their individual beta weights. Beta, the standardized regression coefficient, is the slope of the least-squares line when X and Y are in standardized Z-score form (Norusis, 1986).

Accuracy of prediction in multiple regression analysis may be affected by small sample sizes of less than 50 cases,

the number of predictor variables and high correlation among them, as well as nonlinearity (Johnson, 1977; Norusis, 1986; Roscoe, 1975; Wiersma, 1986). In order to avoid the problem of small sample size, the adjusted R squared was reported in this study.

Tests for Hypotheses

Table 1 contains a list of the method(s) of analysis selected for each null hypothesis proposed in Chapter I. The .05 level of significance was used as the basis for rejecting the null hypotheses.

Table 1

Selected Method(s) of Analysis for Each Hypothesis

Hypothesis	Method(s) of Analysis
1	Chi-Square Test of Independence; Cramer's V Correlation Coefficient
2	One-Way Analysis of Variance
3	One-Way Analysis of Variance
4	Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient
5	Multiple Regression
6	Multiple Regression
7	Multiple Regression

Summary

Two surveys were conducted to obtain information regarding the applicability of Ries and Trout's market positioning theory to the administration of public radio broadcasting from collegiate campuses. The theoretical principles were first verified by expert opinion, then measured for import and usage by three groups of administrators in a national sample of university-licensed public radio stations. Additional facts about the sample concerning audience ratings, contributing membership, and financial allocations, were also gathered.

The data output was analyzed in a manner that permitted statistical testing of seven hypotheses and provided sufficient evidence to answer the research questions. The findings are reported in the next two chapters.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

Introduction

The primary purpose of the study was to examine Ries and Trout's market positioning theory in terms of its usefulness to administrators of university-licensed public radio stations. This chapter presents an analysis of the data which were collected from experts, practitioners, and records to serve this purpose. The results are organized in the same sequence as the three research questions and seven related hypotheses presented in Chapter I.

Research Question One

> What importance is placed upon Ries and Trout's positioning strategies and tactics by a panel of experts and to what extent are they being utilized in public radio?

A written survey instrument was developed and administered to measure the perceptions of an expert panel as to the import and usage of 32 theoretically-derived positioning strategies and tactics. A five-point rating scale--with one equal to the most optimal response and five equal to the least optimal--was employed to measure degrees of importance, while use was scaled on a forced-choice yes/no format.

Twenty-six members of the Board of Directors of National Public Radio and American Public Radio were invited to be on the panel and 17 individuals did contribute their expertise, a 65% response rate. Three surveys returned were unusable for quantitative analysis and so were eliminated, leaving a total of 14 expert judges.

As detailed in Chapter III, criteria had been established in advance of the survey administration to rely on majority rating of 3 or higher on the import scale for validation of each positioning item and for inclusion in the second research instrument. Median scores were also chosen for descriptive analysis in order to minimize the distorting effect of extreme scores in the distribution collected from this small sample group. However, all measures of central tendency are reported in Table 4 in order to provide the most complete information and for purposes of comparison by the reader.

Frequency distribution of the experts' scores on the degree of importance of the positioning techniques is presented in Table 2. A majority of the respondents rated 29 of the 32 survey items (91%) at 3 or higher in importance. More specifically, the experts perceived 22 of the 32 positioning statements (69%) as being above average or greater in importance. Two items (4C and 5A) were also rated 4 or higher by one-half of the panel. Approximately one-sixth (16%) of the positioning strategies and tactics

Table 2

Frequency Distribution of Expert Panel Scores: Survey Item by Import Rating

Item	Degree of Importance 1	2	3	4	5
1.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (25%)	9 (75%)
1A.	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	6 (43%)	6 (43%)
1B.	0 (0%)	3 (21%)	3 (21%)	6 (43%)	2 (14%)
1C.	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	6 (43%)	6 (43%)
1D.	1 (7%)	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	4 (29%)	5 (36%)
1E.	1 (7%)	3 (21%)	2 (14%)	4 (29%)	4 (29%)
1F.	1 (8%)	2 (15%)	5 (38%)	1 (8%)	4 (31%)
2.	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)
2A.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (43%)	5 (36%)	3 (21%)
2B.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (43%)	6 (43%)	2 (14%)
2C.	3 (21%)	3 (21%)	3 (21%)	4 (29%)	1 (7%)
2D.	3 (23%)	3 (23%)	5 (38%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)
2E.	12 (86%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)
3.	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	3 (25%)	7 (58%)
3A.	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	5 (36%)	3 (21%)
3B.	2 (14%)	0 (0%)	3 (21%)	4 (29%)	5 (36%)
3C.	2 (14%)	3 (21%)	3 (21%)	4 (29%)	2 (14%)
3D.	6 (46%)	4 (31%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	2 (15%)
4.	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	3 (25%)	7 (58%)
4A.	0 (0%)	2 (14%)	0 (0%)	5 (36%)	7 (50%)
4B.	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	3 (21%)	4 (29%)	6 (43%)
4C.	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	6 (43%)	3 (21%)	4 (29%)
4D.	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	4 (29%)	1 (7%)	8 (57%)
5.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (42%)	2 (17%)	5 (42%)
5A.	0 (0%)	3 (21%)	4 (29%)	1 (7%)	6 (43%)
5B.	2 (15%)	2 (15%)	5 (38%)	2 (15%)	2 (15%)
5C.	3 (25%)	4 (33%)	3 (25%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)
6.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (25%)	4 (33%)	5 (42%)
6A.	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	2 (14%)	4 (29%)	6 (43%)
6B.	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	2 (14%)	5 (36%)	3 (21%)
6C.	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	3 (21%)	6 (43%)	4 (29%)
6D.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	3 (21%)	10 (71%)

Note. Numbers in parentheses are percentages of total responses per item. Missing observations = 1 for items 1E, 1F, 2D, 3D, 5B; 2 for items 1, 3, 4, 5, 5C, 6; 4 for item 2.

were considered extremely important to implement in public radio stations. Additionally, one item (4A) was scored extremely important by 50% of the experts.

The strategy that received highest acclaim from the panel majority was the first item on the survey, "Focus on the audience," rated extremely important by 75% of the respondents. The highest scored tactic was the last item on the survey, "Enlist support and understanding of the entire station staff . . . ," which 71% of the respondents deemed extremely important.

While none of the positioning statements received unanimous disapproval on the import scale, item 2E did garner the most criticism. The experts overturned the tactic, "Refer to other stations by name . . . ," 86% judging that not important at all.

Frequency distribution of the experts' scores regarding current practice of the positioning techniques is presented in Table 3. A majority of the respondents believed that 24 of the 32 survey items (75%) are actually being utilized in public radio stations today. There were two unanimous votes on this usage scale. All experts perceived the strategy involving audience focus (item 1) is being practiced in public radio. Conversely, they all believed the tactic regarding reference to one's competitors (item 2E) is not being used. The experts were evenly divided on item 4C, one-half holding the opinion that positioning objectives set

Table 3

Frequency Distribution of Expert Panel Scores: Survey Item by Usage Rating

Item	Practice		Total	Percent of Total (N=14)
	Yes	No		
1.	12 (100%)	0 (0%)	12	86%
1A.	7 (54%)	6 (46%)	13	93%
1B.	11 (85%)	2 (15%)	13	93%
1C.	11 (85%)	2 (15%)	13	93%
1D.	9 (69%)	4 (31%)	13	93%
1E.	9 (69%)	4 (31%)	13	93%
1F.	7 (58%)	5 (42%)	12	86%
2.	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	10	71%
2A.	8 (62%)	5 (38%)	13	93%
2B.	8 (62%)	5 (38%)	13	93%
2C.	7 (58%)	5 (42%)	12	86%
2D.	5 (46%)	6 (54%)	11	79%
2E.	0 (0%)	13 (100%)	13	93%
3.	8 (80%)	2 (20%)	10	71%
3A.	8 (67%)	4 (33%)	12	86%
3B.	10 (91%)	1 (9%)	11	79%
3C.	4 (36%)	7 (64%)	11	79%
3D.	2 (18%)	9 (82%)	11	79%
4.	6 (54%)	5 (46%)	11	79%
4A.	8 (62%)	5 (38%)	13	93%
4B.	10 (83%)	2 (17%)	12	86%
4C.	6 (50%)	6 (50%)	12	86%
4D.	9 (75%)	3 (25%)	12	86%
5.	7 (78%)	2 (22%)	9	64%
5A.	7 (70%)	3 (30%)	10	71%
5B.	4 (44%)	5 (56%)	9	64%
5C.	4 (44%)	5 (56%)	9	64%
6.	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	10	71%
6A.	9 (82%)	2 (18%)	11	79%
6B.	5 (42%)	7 (58%)	12	86%
6C.	4 (33%)	8 (67%)	12	86%
6D.	10 (83%)	2 (17%)	12	86%

Note. Numbers in parentheses are percentages of total responses per item.

the direction for the station activities, while the other half thought this tactic is unused in public radio.

Measures of central tendency listed in Table 4 illustrate the most typical import scores on each survey item from the expert panel as a whole group. In light of the small sample size, the reader is again reminded to consider the median as the best representative score of the collection (Johnson 1977; McMillan & Schumacher, 1984; Roscoe, 1975; Sax, 1974). Twenty-two of the 32 survey items (69%) had median scores of 4 or 5, above average to extremely important.

A general distribution of the import and usage scores is presented in Table 5. It portrays the scores as abnormally distributed, or negatively skewed, with most located at the high end of the distribution.

It is worth noting that five positioning tactics were believed to be important by the expert panel (rated 3 or greater), although considered by the majority to be unutilized in public radio. The important but unused tactics are as follows:

Item 2D. Avoid direct competition with the market leader.

3C. Create a new market niche based on audience lifestyle preferences.

5B. Modify complex messages by restraining creative techniques.

6B. Decide long-range (5-10 year) positioning goals.

Table 4

Measures of Central Tendency:
Survey Item by Expert Panel Import Scores

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Mode
1.	4.75	.45	5.00	5.00
1A.	4.21	.89	4.00	4.00
1B.	3.50	1.02	4.00	4.00
1C.	4.21	.89	4.00	4.00
1D.	3.64	1.40	4.00	5.00
1E.	3.50	1.34	4.00	4.00
1F.	3.38	1.32	3.00	3.00
2.	3.60	.84	4.00	4.00
2A.	3.79	.80	4.00	3.00
2B.	3.71	.73	4.00	3.00
2C.	2.79	1.31	3.00	4.00
2D.	2.54	1.20	3.00	3.00
2E.	1.36	1.08	1.00	1.00
3.	4.25	1.22	5.00	5.00
3A.	3.36	1.39	4.00	4.00
3B.	3.71	1.38	4.00	5.00
3C.	3.07	1.33	3.00	4.00
3D.	2.08	1.44	2.00	1.00
4.	4.33	.99	5.00	5.00
4A.	4.21	1.05	4.50	5.00
4B.	4.07	1.00	4.00	5.00
4C.	3.71	.99	3.50	3.00
4D.	4.14	1.10	5.00	5.00
5.	4.00	.95	4.00	3.00
5A.	3.71	1.27	3.50	5.00
5B.	3.00	1.29	3.00	3.00
5C.	2.42	1.24	2.00	2.00
6.	4.17	.84	4.00	5.00
6A.	3.93	1.27	4.00	5.00
6B.	3.29	1.49	4.00	4.00
6C.	3.93	.92	4.00	4.00
6D.	4.64	.63	5.00	5.00

Table 5

General Distribution of Expert Panel
Median Import and Usage Scores

Class Interval	Overall Frequency	Percent of Area	Frequency of Practice
5.00-4.50	6	19%	6
4.49-4.00	16	50%	14
3.99-3.50	2	6%	2
3.49-3.00	5	16%	2
2.99-2.50	0	0%	0
2.49-2.00	2	6%	0
1.99-1.50	0	0%	0
1.49-1.00	1	3%	0
	n = 32	100%	n = 24

Note: Frequency of practice is for majority response.

6C. Allocate a sufficiently large budget for advertising and promotional activities.

There were three positioning tactics that failed to achieve majority consensus of importance and had median scores of less than 3.00. On the basis of this rating, they were held as invalid for applicability to public radio, thus eliminated for further consideration and dropped from the second research instrument. These three were also judged as not practiced in public radio stations. The unimportant and unused tactics are as follows:

Item 2E. Refer to other stations by name in one's own promos and advertising.

3D. Associate one's programming with the market leader.

5C. Oversimplify messages in order to make long-lasting impressions.

Test of Hypothesis One

HO_1: There is no relationship between the experts' ratings of the degree of importance and use of the positioning strategies and tactics in public radio stations.

A chi-square test of independence for contingency tables was employed to determine if there was a statistically significant relationship between the expert panel's import and usage scores. Chi-squares were obtained and examined for each survey item. As presented in Table 6, three of the 32 survey items were statistically significant at the .05 alpha level.

Table 6

Chi-Square Test and Cramer's V:
Crosstabulation of Expert Panel Import and Usage Scores

Item	Chi-Square	df	P	Cramer's V
1.	--	--	--	--
1A.	3.74	3	.29	.54
1B.	2.76	3	.43	.46
1C.	6.60	3	.09	.71
1D.	4.24	4	.38	.57
1E.	3.61	4	.46	.53
1F.	7.89	4	.10	.81
2.	3.89	3	.27	.62
2A.	4.55	2	.10	.59
2B.	1.17	2	.56	.30
2C.	7.20	4	.13	.78
2D.	3.47	3	.32	.56
2E.	--	--	--	--
3.	4.79	3	.19	.69
3A.	6.38	4	.17	.73
3B.	11.00	3	.01*	1.00
3C.	5.24	4	.26	.69
3D.	11.00	3	.01*	1.00
4.	1.40	2	.50	.36
4A.	1.89	2	.39	.38
4B.	.60	2	.74	.22
4C.	3.20	3	.36	.52
4D.	2.10	2	.35	.42
5.	3.21	2	.20	.60
5A.	10.00	3	.02*	1.00
5B.	4.28	4	.37	.69
5C.	6.30	4	.18	.84
6.	3.06	2	.22	.55
6A.	5.96	4	.20	.74
6B.	4.80	4	.31	.63
6C.	6.00	3	.11	.71
6D.	.90	2	.64	.27

Note: Missing observations ranged from 1-6. (See Table 2, 3). N = 14, * indicates significant at $P<.05$, one-tailed.

Analysis of the corresponding Cramer's V coefficients also listed in Table 6 revealed moderate to strong relationships between all but one (4B) of the import and usage scores. Most of the coefficients fell within the .51 to .75 range, indicating moderately high association. Perfect correlations of 1.00 were computed for the three items, 3B, 3D, and 5A. Correlation coefficients of .30 or larger are generally considered good in social and behavioral science research (Champion, 1981).

It should also be noted that statistical tests could not be performed on two survey items (1 and 2E) due to the disproportional size of the contingency tables when the expert judges cast unanimous votes on the usage scale. Nevertheless, inspection of the arrangement of frequencies for these two score sets, reported in Table 2 and Table 3, can provide an intuitive sense of the magnitude of their relationships.

Based on data obtained from the chi-square tests and associated Cramer's V correlation coefficients, there was only weak evidence to support the rejection of null Hypothesis One and it was retained. However, in light of the three statistically significant items noted above, these results should be regarded as inconclusive. There is a possibility that additional research may produce more definitive data.

Research Question Two

What importance is placed upon the expert-verified positioning strategies and tactics by selected administrators and to what extent are they being utilized in university-licensed public radio stations?

A telephone survey instrument was implemented to measure the perceptions of selected administrators at university-licensed public radio stations as to the import and usage of market positioning techniques. The testing instrument was an adapted version of the previously administered written survey. It contained 29 theoretically-derived, expert-verified positioning strategies and tactics. The same rating scale was employed, offering a choice of five degrees of importance and yes/no for practice.

All administrators classified as General/Station Managers, Program Directors, and Development/Promotion Directors, representing CPB-qualified, Class C public radio stations licensed to public state colleges and universities, were invited to participate in the survey. Administrators affiliated with 45 of the 54 eligible stations agreed to take part in the study, an 83% response rate. Thirty-two people from each of the three administrative groups designated above--a total of 96 individuals--completed the telephone survey interviews.

Frequency distribution of the administrators' scores on the degree of importance of the positioning techniques is presented in Table 7. A majority of the respondents rated 28 of the 29 survey items (97%) at 3 or higher in

Table 7

Frequency Distribution of Administrators' Scores: Survey Item by Import Rating

Item	Degree of Importance 1	2	3	4	5
1.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (4%)	24 (25%)	68 (71%)
2.	0 (0%)	8 (8%)	9 (9%)	38 (40%)	41 (43%)
3.	13 (14%)	28 (29%)	27 (28%)	15 (16%)	13 (13%)
4.	1 (1%)	3 (3%)	14 (15%)	43 (45%)	35 (36%)
5.	1 (1%)	5 (5%)	10 (10%)	43 (45%)	37 (38%)
6.	7 (7%)	24 (25%)	17 (18%)	27 (28%)	21 (22%)
7.	4 (4%)	17 (18%)	36 (38%)	18 (19%)	21 (22%)
8.	17 (18%)	24 (25%)	23 (24%)	21 (22%)	11 (12%)
9.	12 (12%)	24 (25%)	26 (27%)	24 (25%)	10 (10%)
10.	13 (14%)	27 (28%)	22 (23%)	25 (26%)	9 (9%)
11.	21 (22%)	28 (29%)	14 (15%)	25 (26%)	8 (8%)
12.	20 (21%)	24 (25%)	15 (16%)	20 (21%)	17 (18%)
13.	4 (4%)	1 (1%)	6 (6%)	21 (22%)	64 (68%)
14.	11 (12%)	16 (17%)	22 (23%)	24 (25%)	23 (24%)
15.	6 (6%)	6 (6%)	12 (12%)	34 (35%)	38 (40%)
16.	6 (6%)	14 (15%)	19 (20%)	32 (33%)	25 (26%)
17.	2 (2%)	3 (3%)	3 (3%)	23 (24%)	65 (68%)
18.	3 (3%)	6 (6%)	6 (6%)	25 (26%)	56 (58%)
19.	3 (3%)	3 (3%)	4 (4%)	26 (27%)	60 (62%)
20.	2 (2%)	6 (6%)	12 (12%)	30 (31%)	46 (48%)
21.	2 (2%)	8 (8%)	5 (5%)	32 (33%)	49 (51%)
22.	3 (3%)	4 (4%)	14 (15%)	36 (38%)	39 (41%)
23.	3 (3%)	3 (3%)	17 (18%)	35 (36%)	38 (40%)
24.	9 (9%)	19 (20%)	18 (19%)	24 (25%)	26 (27%)
25.	2 (2%)	3 (3%)	6 (6%)	34 (35%)	51 (53%)
26.	2 (2%)	4 (4%)	10 (10%)	38 (40%)	42 (44%)
27.	6 (6%)	10 (10%)	21 (22%)	24 (25%)	35 (36%)
28.	7 (7%)	6 (6%)	16 (17%)	24 (25%)	43 (45%)
29.	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	21 (22%)	74 (77%)

Note. Numbers in parentheses are percentages of total responses per item. $N = 96$.

importance. More specifically, the administrators perceived 20 of the 29 positioning statements (69%) as being above average or greater in importance. One item (6) was also rated 4 or higher by 50% of the administrators. More than one-fourth (28%) of the positioning strategies and tactics were considered extremely important by the majority.

As a whole group, the university-licensed public radio station administrators had high regard for the individual positioning strategies (survey items 1, 8, 13, 17, 22, 25).

The majority scored four of the six basic strategies as being of extreme importance. The strategy and tactics involving competition (items 8-12) generally received the lowest ratings. Nearly one-quarter of all the participants believed that it is not important to "exploit weaknesses of competing stations" (item 11).

Frequency distribution of the administrators' scores regarding current practice of the positioning techniques is presented in Table 8. A majority of the respondents reported that 21 of the 29 positioning methods (72%) are being practiced at their stations. The eight unused procedures involved qualitative research (item 2), narrow target audience (item 3), competition (items 8-12), and sufficient advertising/promotion budget (item 28). Although not practiced, the administrators did consider all but one to be rather important, as evidenced by their scores of 3 or greater. The only tactic deemed both unimportant and

Table 8

Frequency Distribution of Administrators' Scores: Survey Item by Usage Rating

Item	Practice: Yes		Practice: No	
1.	92	(96%)	4	(4%)
2.	46	(48%)	50	(52%)
3.	39	(41%)	57	(59%)
4.	80	(83%)	16	(17%)
5.	78	(81%)	18	(19%)
6.	58	(60%)	38	(40%)
7.	61	(64%)	35	(36%)
8.	37	(38%)	59	(62%)
9.	40	(42%)	56	(58%)
10.	38	(40%)	58	(60%)
11.	35	(36%)	61	(64%)
12.	47	(49%)	49	(51%)
13.	81	(84%)	15	(16%)
14.	64	(67%)	32	(33%)
15.	81	(84%)	15	(16%)
16.	49	(51%)	47	(49%)
17.	77	(80%)	19	(20%)
18.	61	(64%)	35	(36%)
19.	71	(74%)	25	(26%)
20.	67	(70%)	29	(30%)
21.	79	(82%)	17	(18%)
22.	82	(85%)	14	(15%)
23.	83	(86%)	13	(14%)
24.	56	(58%)	40	(42%)
25.	83	(86%)	13	(14%)
26.	80	(83%)	16	(17%)
27.	49	(51%)	47	(49%)
28.	21	(22%)	75	(78%)
29.	82	(85%)	14	(15%)

Note. Numbers in parentheses are percentages of total responses per item. $N = 96$.

unutilized by the majority was survey item 11, concerning exploitation of competitors' weaknesses.

In order to analyze measures of central tendency in a comprehensible, manageable format, the 96 administrators' import scores for the six strategies and their related tactics were added together and mean scores computed. It was then possible to rank order the condensed scores to see how the administrators typically perceived the importance of these positioning methods. When strategies and accompanying tactics were averaged together, the resulting mean scores for each overall strategy theme ranked in importance as follows:

1 Consistency -------- 4.33
2 Commitment --------- 4.19
3 Simplicity --------- 3.85
4 Market Niche ------- 3.83
5 Audience Focus ----- 3.81
6 Competition Focus -- 2.86

The data were also examined by the three separate administrative group classifications. Frequency distribution of General/Station Managers' scores on the degree of importance of the positioning techniques is presented in Table 9. A majority of the respondents rated 28 on the 29 survey items (97%) at 3 or higher in importance. More specifically, the general managers perceived 21 of the 29 positioning statements (72%) as being

Table 9

Frequency Distribution of General/Station Managers' Scores: Survey Item by Import Rating

Item	Degree of Importance 1	2	3	4	5
1.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	5 (16%)	26 (81%)
2.	0 (0%)	3 (9%)	4 (12%)	9 (28%)	16 (50%)
3.	5 (16%)	9 (28%)	7 (22%)	5 (16%)	6 (19%)
4.	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	4 (12%)	14 (44%)	12 (38%)
5.	1 (3%)	3 (9%)	3 (9%)	12 (38%)	13 (41%)
6.	4 (12%)	8 (25%)	4 (12%)	9 (28%)	7 (22%)
7.	1 (3%)	7 (22%)	10 (31%)	8 (25%)	6 (19%)
8.	7 (22%)	5 (16%)	9 (28%)	6 (19%)	5 (16%)
9.	6 (19%)	7 (22%)	10 (31%)	5 (16%)	4 (12%)
10.	7 (22%)	6 (19%)	11 (34%)	4 (12%)	4 (12%)
11.	7 (22%)	10 (31%)	5 (16%)	6 (19%)	4 (12%)
12.	10 (31%)	4 (12%)	7 (22%)	6 (19%)	5 (16%)
13.	3 (9%)	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	4 (12%)	23 (72%)
14.	5 (16%)	5 (16%)	5 (16%)	8 (25%)	9 (28%)
15.	3 (9%)	1 (3%)	4 (12%)	12 (38%)	12 (38%)
16.	2 (6%)	5 (16%)	5 (16%)	9 (28%)	11 (34%)
17.	2 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	5 (16%)	24 (75%)
18.	2 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	9)28%)	20 (62%)
19.	2 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (25%)	22 (69%)
20.	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	5 (16%)	9 (28%)	16 (50%)
21.	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	9 (28%)	19 (59%)
22.	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	6 (19%)	11 (34%)	12 (38%)
23.	2 (6%)	0 (0%)	8 (25%)	7 (22%)	15 (47%)
24.	3 (9%)	5 (16%)	7 (22%)	9 (28%)	8 (25%)
25.	2 (6%)	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	9 (28%)	19 (59%)
26.	2 (6%)	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	9 (28%)	19 (59%)
27.	3 (9%)	3 (9%)	6 (19%)	8 (25%)	12 (38%)
28.	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	6 (19%)	9 (28%)	14 (44%)
29.	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (22%)	24 (75%)

Note. Numbers in parentheses are percentages of total responses per item. n = 32.

above average or greater in importance. One item (6) was also rated 4 or higher by one-half of the managers. Nearly one-third (31%) of the positioning strategies and tactics were considered extremely important by the majority. Additionally, two items (2 and 20) were scored extremely important by 50% of the managers.

As a separate administrative group, the general managers had high regard for the individual positioning strategies (survey items 1, 8, 13, 17, 22, 25). The majority scored four of the six basic strategies as being of extreme importance. The strategy and tactics involving competition (items 8-12) generally received the lowest ratings. Nearly one-third of all managers believed that it is not important to "avoid direct competition with the market leader" (item 12).

Frequency distribution of the general managers' scores regarding current practice of the positioning techniques is presented in Table 10. A majority of the respondents reported that 21 of the 29 positioning methods (72%) are being practiced at their stations. The eight unused procedures involved qualitative research (item 2), narrow target audience (item 3), competition (items 8-11), long-range goals (item 27), and sufficient advertising/promotion budget (item 28). The managers were evenly divided on item 12, one-half practicing avoidance of direct competition with their market leader, while the other half did not employ

Table 10

Frequency Distribution of General/Station Managers' Scores: Survey Item by Usage Rating

	Practice	
Item	Yes	No
1.	30 (94%)	2 (6%)
2.	12 (38%)	20 (62%)
3.	14 (44%)	18 (56%)
4.	28 (88%)	4 (12%)
5.	27 (84%)	5 (16%)
6.	20 (62%)	12 (38%)
7.	21 (66%)	11 (34%)
8.	13 (41%)	19 (59%)
9.	11 (34%)	21 (66%)
10.	10 (31%)	22 (69%)
11.	13 (41%)	19 (59%)
12.	16 (50%)	16 (50%)
13.	27 (84%)	5 (16%)
14.	20 (62%)	12 (38%)
15.	26 (81%)	6 (19%)
16.	18 (56%)	14 (44%)
17.	24 (75%)	8 (25%)
18.	20 (62%)	12 (38%)
19.	24 (75%)	8 (25%)
20.	24 (75%)	8 (25%)
21.	26 (81%)	6 (19%)
22.	27 (84%)	5 (16%)
23.	27 (84%)	5 (16%)
24.	20 (62%)	12 (38%)
25.	27 (84%)	5 (16%)
26.	27 (84%)	5 (16%)
27.	15 (47%)	17 (53%)
28.	6 (19%)	26 (81%)
29.	27 (84%)	5 (16%)

Note. Numbers in parentheses are percentages of total responses per item. $n = 32$.

this tactic. Although a total of 8 tactics were not practiced by the majority, general managers did consider all but one of the above mentioned to be rather important, as evidenced by their scores of 3 or greater. The only tactic deemed both unimportant and unutilized by the majority was survey item 11, concerning exploitation of competitors' weaknesses.

Measures of central tendency were analyzed in the same format as those reported previously for the entire sample of administrators. The 32 general managers' import scores for the six strategies and their related tactics were added together and mean scores computed. It was then possible to rank order the condensed scores to see how the general managers--as a distinct group--typically perceived the importance of these positioning methods. When strategies and accompanying tactics were averaged together, the resulting mean scores for each overall strategy theme ranked in importance as follows:

1 Consistency -------- 4.39

2 Commitment --------- 4.21

3 Market Niche ------- 3.83

4 Simplicity --------- 3.80

5 Audience Focus ----- 3.79

6 Competition Focus -- 2.78

Frequency distribution of Program Directors' scores on the degree of importance of the positioning techniques is

presented in Table 11. A majority of the respondents rated 25 of the 29 survey items (86%) at 3 or higher. One item (9) was also rated average or better by 50% of the group. More specifically, the program directors perceived 20 or the 29 positioning statements (69%) as being above average or greater in importance. Two items (16 and 27) were also rated 4 or higher by one-half of the directors. Approximately one-seventh (14%) of the positioning strategies and tactics were considered extremely important by the majority. Additionally, one item (18) was scored extremely important by 50% of the program directors.

As a separate administrative group, the program directors had above average regard for the individual positioning strategies (survey items 1, 8, 13, 17, 22, 25). The majority scored three of the six basic strategies as being of extreme importance. The strategy and tactics involving competition (items 8-12) generally received the lowest ratings. Nearly one-quarter of all the program directors believed that it is neither important to "direct programming to a narrow target audience" (item 3) nor to "focus on the competition" (item 8).

Frequency distribution of the program directors' scores regarding current practice of the positioning techniques is presented in Table 12. A majority of the respondents reported that 21 of the 29 positioning methods (72%) are being practiced at their stations. The eight unused

Table 11

Frequency Distribution of Program Directors' Scores: Survey Item by Import Rating

Item	Degree of Importance 1	2	3	4	5
1.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (9%)	7 (22%)	22 (69%)
2.	0 (0%)	4 (12%)	4 (12%)	13 (41%)	11 (34%)
3.	7 (22%)	10 (31%)	6 (19%)	5 (16%)	4 (12%)
4.	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	6 (19%)	11 (34%)	13 (41%)
5.	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	5 (16%)	12 (38%)	13 (41%)
6.	3 (9%)	11 (34%)	4 (12%)	9 (28%)	5 (16%)
7.	3 (9%)	5 (16%)	13 (41%)	4 (12%)	7 (22%)
8.	7 (22%)	12 (38%)	7 (22%)	4 (12%)	2 (6%)
9.	5 (16%)	11 (34%)	5 (16%)	9 (28%)	2 (6%)
10.	5 (16%)	13 (41%)	3 (9%)	9 (28%)	2 (6%)
11.	6 (19%)	11 (34%)	3 (9%)	10 (31%)	2 (6%)
12.	4 (12%)	6 (19%)	8 (25%)	10 (31%)	4 (12%)
13.	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	4 (12%)	5 (16%)	21 (66%)
14.	4 (12%)	6 (19%)	9 (28%)	8 (25%)	5 (16%)
15.	1 (3%)	4 (12%)	5 (16%)	10 (31%)	12 (38%)
16.	3 (9%)	7 (22%)	6 (19%)	11 (34%)	5 (16%)
17.	0 (0%)	3 (9%)	2 (6%)	10 (31%)	17 (53%)
18.	1 (3%)	4 (12%)	5 (16%)	6 (19%)	16 (50%)
19.	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	4 (12%)	11 (34%)	14 (44%)
20.	1 (3%)	4 (12%)	6 (19%)	9 (28%)	12 (38%)
21.	1 (3%)	5 (16%)	1 (3%)	14 (44%)	11 (34%)
22.	1 (3%)	3 (9%)	4 (12%)	14 (44%)	10 (31%)
23.	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	4 (12%)	15 (47%)	10 (31%)
24.	3 (9%)	8 (25%)	4 (12%)	9 (28%)	8 (25%)
25.	0 (0%)	3 (9%)	3 (9%)	13 (41%)	13 (41%)
26.	0 (0%)	3 (9%)	3 (9%)	13 (41%)	13 (41%)
27.	1 (3%)	5 (16%)	10 (31%)	5 (16%)	11 (34%)
28.	4 (12%)	5 (16%)	5 (16%)	8 (25%)	10 (31%)
29.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (25%)	24 (75%)

Note. Numbers in parentheses are percentages of total responses per item. $n = 32$.

Table 12

Frequency Distribution of Program Directors' Scores: Survey Item by Usage Rating

Item	Practice	
	Yes	No
1.	30 (94%)	2 (6%)
2.	15 (47%)	17 (53%)
3.	11 (34%)	21 (66%)
4.	25 (78%)	7 (22%)
5.	25 (78%)	7 (22%)
6.	18 (56%)	14 (44%)
7.	19 (59%)	13 (41%)
8.	10 (31%)	22 (69%)
9.	11 (34%)	21 (66%)
10.	11 (34%)	21 (66%)
11.	12 (38%)	20 (62%)
12.	16 (50%)	16 (50%)
13.	25 (78%)	7 (22%)
14.	21 (66%)	11 (34%)
15.	27 (84%)	5 (16%)
16.	15 (47%)	17 (53%)
17.	27 (84%)	5 (16%)
18.	19 (59%)	13 (41%)
19.	21 (66%)	11 (34%)
20.	21 (66%)	11 (34%)
21.	25 (78%)	7 (22%)
22.	24 (75%)	8 (25%)
23.	25 (78%)	7 (22%)
24.	17 (53%)	15 (47%)
25.	25 (78%)	7 (22%)
26.	25 (78%)	7 (22%)
27.	16 (50%)	16 (50%)
28.	6 (19%)	26 (81%)
29.	27 (84%)	5 (16%)

Note. Numbers in parentheses are percentages of total responses per item. $n = 32$.

procedures involved qualitative research (item 2), narrow target audience (item 3), competition (items 8-11), market niches based on lifestyles (item 16), and sufficient advertising/promotion budget (item 28). The programmers were evenly divided on two items (12 and 27), one-half practicing avoidance of direct competition with their market leader and formulation of long-range goals, while the other half did not employ either tactic. Although split on usage of these two tactics, the majority thought they were important, as evidence by scores of 3 or greater. Items 2, 16, and 28 were also believed to be important, but currently unpracticed. Items 3, 8, 10, and 11 were deemed both unimportant and unutilized by the majority. The programmers were again divided on the import of evaluating competitors' strengths (item 9), the majority not practicing this tactic, but at least 50% believing it to be important.

Measures of central tendency were analyzed in the same format as those reported previously for the entire sample of administrators and for the general managers separately. The 32 program directors' import scores for the six strategies and their related tactics were added together and mean scores computed. It was then possible to rank order the condensed scores to see how the program directors--as a distinct group--typically perceived the importance of these positioning methods. When strategies and accompanying tactics were averaged together, the resulting mean scores

for each overall strategy theme ranked in importance as follows:

1 Consistency -------- 4.02

2 Commitment --------- 4.01

3 Simplicity --------- 3.74

4 Audience Focus ----- 3.67

5 Market Niche ------- 3.66

6 Competition Focus -- 2.74

Frequency distribution of Development/Promotion Directors' scores on the degree of importance of the positioning techniques is presented in Table 13. A majority of the respondents rated 28 of the 29 survey items (97%) at 3 or higher. More specifically, the development directors perceived 22 of the 29 positioning statements (76%) as being above average or greater in importance. One item (24) was also rated 4 or higher by one-half of the directors. More than one-third (38%) of the positioning strategies and tactics were considered extremely important by the majority.

As a separate administrative group, the development directors had very high regard for the individual positioning strategies (survey items 1, 8, 13, 17, 22, 25). The majority scored five of the six basic strategies as being of extreme importance. The strategy and tactics involving competition (items 8-12) generally received the lowest ratings. One-quarter of all development directors believed that it is not important to "exploit weaknesses of competing stations" (item 11).

Table 13

Frequency Distribution of Development/Promotion Directors' Scores: Survey Item by Import Rating

Item	Degree of Importance 1	2	3	4	5
1.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	12 (38%)	20 (62%)
2.	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	16 (50%)	14 (44%)
3.	1 (3%)	9 (28%)	14 (44%)	5 (16%)	3 (9%)
4.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (12%)	18 (56%)	10 (31%)
5.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	19 (59%)	11 (34%)
6.	0 (0%)	5 (16%)	9 (28%)	9 (28%)	9 (28%)
7.	0 (0%)	5 (16%)	13 (41%)	6 (19%)	8 (25%)
8.	3 (9%)	7 (22%)	7 (22%)	11 (34%)	4 (12%)
9.	1 (3%)	6 (19%)	11 (34%)	10 (31%)	4 (12%)
10.	1 (3%)	8 (25%)	8 (25%)	12 (38%)	3 (9%)
11.	8 (25%)	7 (22%)	6 (19%)	9 (28%)	2 (6%)
12.	6 (19%)	14 (44%)	0 (0%)	4 (12%)	8 (25%)
13.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	12 (38%)	20 (62%)
14.	2 (6%)	5 (16%)	8 (25%)	8 (25%)	9 (28%)
15.	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	3 (9%)	12 (38%)	14 (44%)
16.	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	8 (25%)	12 (38%)	9 (28%)
17.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (25%)	24 (75%)
18.	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	0 (0%)	10 (31%)	20 (62%)
19.	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	7 (22%)	24 (75%)
20.	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	12 (38%)	18 (56%)
21.	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	3 (9%)	9 (28%)	19 (59%)
22.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (12%)	11 (34%)	17 (53%)
23.	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	5 (16%)	13 (41%)	13 (41%)
24.	3 (9%)	6 (19%)	7 (22%)	6 (19%)	10 (31%)
25.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	12 (38%)	19 (59%)
26.	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	5 (16%)	16 (50%)	10 (31%)
27.	2 (6%)	2 (6%)	5 (16%)	11 (34%)	12 (38%)
28.	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	5 (16%)	7 (22%)	19 (59%)
29.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (19%)	26 (81%)

Note. Numbers in parentheses are percentages of total reponses per item. n = 32.

Frequency distribution of the development directors' scores regarding current practice of the positioning techniques is presented in Table 14. A majority of the respondents reported that 24 of the 29 positioning methods (83%) are being practiced at their stations. The five unused procedures involved narrow target audience (item 3), competition (items 8, 11, 12), and sufficient advertising/ promotion budget (item 28). The directors were equally divided on item 16, one-half creating market niches based on audience lifestyles, while the other half did not employ this tactic. Although a total of 5 tactics were not practiced, the directors did consider all but one of the above mentioned to be rather important, as evidenced by their scores of 3 or greater. The only tactic deemed both unimportant and unutilized by the majority was survey item 12, concerning the avoidance of direct competition with a market leader.

Measures of central tendency were analyzed in the same format as those reported previously for the entire sample of administrators, as well as for the general managers and program directors separately. The 32 development directors' import scores for the six strategies and their related tactics were added together and mean scores computed. It was then possible to rank order the condensed scores to see how the development directors--as a distinct group--typically perceived the importance of these positioning

Table 14

Frequency Distribution of Development/Promotion Directors' Scores: Survey Item by Usage Rating

Item	Practice: Yes	Practice: No
1.	32 (100%)	0 (0%)
2.	19 (59%)	13 (41%)
3.	14 (44%)	18 (56%)
4.	27 (84%)	5 (16%)
5.	26 (81%)	6 (19%)
6.	20 (62%)	12 (38%)
7.	21 (66%)	11 (34%)
8.	14 (44%)	18 (56%)
9.	18 (56%)	14 (44%)
10.	17 (53%)	15 (47%)
11.	10 (31%)	22 (69%)
12.	15 (47%)	17 (53%)
13.	29 (91%)	3 (9%)
14.	23 (72%)	9 (28%)
15.	28 (88%)	4 (12%)
16.	16 (50%)	16 (50%)
17.	26 (81%)	6 (19%)
18.	22 (69%)	10 (31%)
19.	26 (81%)	6 (19%)
20.	22 (69%)	10 (31%)
21.	28 (88%)	4 (12%)
22.	31 (97%)	1 (3%)
23.	31 (97%)	1 (3%)
24.	19 (59%)	13 (41%)
25.	31 (97%)	1 (3%)
26.	28 (88%)	4 (12%)
27.	18 (56%)	14 (44%)
28.	9 (28%)	23 (72%)
29.	28 (88%)	4 (12%)

Note. Numbers in parentheses are percentages of total responses per item. $n = 32$.

methods. When strategies and accompanying tactics were averaged together, the resulting mean scores for each overall strategy theme ranked in importance as follows:

1 Consistency -------- 4.57
2 Commitment --------- 4.34
3 Market Niche ------- 4.02
4 Simplicity --------- 4.01
5 Audience Focus ----- 3.95
6 Competition Focus -- 3.05

In sum, the university-license public radio station administrators, as a whole group, were favorably inclined toward the positioning techniques in terms of both perceived import and usage. When examined separately according to the three administrative classifications, the data revealed Development/Promotion Directors as the group most positive about the positioning strategies and tactics. Their responses resembled those of General/Station Managers, although the managers were somewhat more restrained in their acclamations. Program Directors were the least generous in their overall scoring when compared with the other two groups.

The three groups of administrators differed in the rank order of their condensed strategy theme scores. All did rank Consistency first, Commitment second, and Competition Focus last. However, programmers had stronger regard for Simplicity and Audience Focus than either managers or development people.

Test of Hypothesis Two

HO_2: There is no difference between university station administrators classified as general managers, program directors, and development directors with regard to degree of importance assigned to the positioning strategies and tactics.

One-way analysis of variance was employed to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in import scores between the administrative groups. The 29 survey items scored on the five-point import scale were divided first according to responses from the three types of administrators. The measures from each group were then condensed into six means by averaging together the strategies and their respective tactics. Analysis of variance was subsequently performed on these grouped import means, arranged thematically by strategy.

As presented in Table 15, the F-score and probability for only one of the six strategy themes was statistically significant at the .05 alpha level. Respondents classified as program directors and development directors differed significantly in their import ratings of the consistency strategy and its accompanying tactics. There were no statistically significant differences among the other five mean scores between the administrative groups.

Based on data obtained from the one-way analysis of variance test, there was insufficient evidence to support the rejection of null Hypothesis Two and it was retained. However, in light of the one significantly different factor

Table 15

One-Way Analysis of Variance:
Administrative Group by Mean Import Scores

Group	Strategy 1 (Audience Focus) Mean	Standard Error
General Managers	26.59	.79
Program Directors	25.72	.80
Development Directors	27.66	.50

F = 1.86; P = 0.16, not significant at P<.05.

Group	Strategy 2 (Competition Focus) Mean	Standard Error
General Managers	13.91	.92
Program Directors	13.72	.78
Development Directors	15.25	.66

F = 1.12; P = 0.33, not significant at P<.05.

Group	Strategy 3 (Market Niche) Mean	Standard Error
General Managers	15.31	.76
Program Directors	14.62	.52
Development Directors	16.06	.48

F = 1.45; P = 0.24, not significant at P<.05.

Table 15--continued

Group	Strategy 4 (Consistency) Mean	Standard Error
General Managers	21.97 ab	.74
Program Directors	20.12 a	.84
Development Directors	22.84 b	.48

F = 3.88; P = 0.02*; means followed by same letter are not significantly different at P<.05.

Group	Strategy 5 (Simplicity) Mean	Standard Error
General Managers	11.41	.55
Program Directors	11.22	.53
Development Directors	12.03	.42

F = 0.71; P = 0.49, not significant at P<.05.

Group	Strategy 6 (Commitment) Mean	Standard Error
General Managers	22.06	.74
Program Directors	20.09	.65
Development Directors	21.72	.43

F = 1.73; P = 0.18, not significant at P<.05.

noted above, these findings should be regarded as inconclusive.

Test of Hypothesis Three

HO_3: There is no difference between university station administrators classified as general managers, program directors, and development directors with regard to use of the positioning strategies and tactics.

One-way analysis of variance was employed to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in usage scores between the administrative groups. The 29 survey items score on the dichotomous practice scale were divided first according to the three types of administrators. The measures from each group were then condensed into six mean scores by averaging together the strategies and their respective tactics. Analysis of variance was subsequently performed on these grouped usage means, arranged thematically by strategy.

As presented in Table 16, the F-scores and probabilities for the six strategy themes were statistically nonsignificant at the .05 alpha level. No significant differences in the variance of the mean score ratings were demonstrated among the three administrative groups.

Based on data obtained from the one-way analysis of variance test, there was insufficient evidence to support the rejection of null Hypothesis Three and it was retained. However, these results should be regarded as inconclusive. While statistically significant differences were not proven

Table 16

One-Way Analysis of Variance:
Administrative Group by Mean Usage Scores

Group	Strategy 1 (Audience Focus) Mean	Standard Error
General Managers	4.75	.31
Program Directors	4.47	.29
Development Directors	4.97	.28

F = 0.73; P = 0.48, not significant at P<.05.

Group	Strategy 2 (Competition Focus) Mean	Standard Error
General Managers	1.97	.30
Program Directors	1.88	.29
Development Directors	2.31	.26

F = 0.66; P = 0.52, not significant at P<.05.

Group	Strategy 3 (Market Niche) Mean	Standard Error
General Managers	2.84	.20
Program Directors	2.75	.17
Development Directors	3.00	.18

F = 0.46; P = 0.63, not significant at P<.05.

Table 16--continued

Group	Strategy 4 (Consistency) Mean	Standard Error
General Managers	3.69	.31
Program Directors	3.53	.31
Development Directors	3.88	.26

F = 0.34; P = 0.71; not significant at P<.05.

Group	Strategy 5 (Simplicity) Mean	Standard Error
General Managers	2.31	.17
Program Directors	2.06	.21
Development Directors	2.53	.10

F = 2.03; P = 0.14, not significant at P<.05.

Group	Strategy 6 (Commitment) Mean	Standard Error
General Managers	3.19	.24
Program Directors	3.09	.23
Development Directors	3.56	.18

F = 1.33; P = 0.27, not significant at P<.05.

by this particular experiment, it is possible that further investigation may yield more definitive results.

Test of Hypothesis Four

HO_4: There is no relationship between the degree of importance assigned to and use of the positioning strategies and tactics by the three administrative groups.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed to determine if there was a statistically significant relationship between the administrators' import and usage scores. The six mean scores arranged thematically by group, as used in Hypotheses Two and Three, were also applied in the test of this hypothesis. Pearson r values were calculated and examined for each of the three administrative groups.

As displayed in Table 17, fifteen of the 18 correlation coefficients were statistically significant at the .05 alpha level. In fact, thirteen of the 18 were statistically significant at the more conservative .01 alpha level, implying an increasingly remote probability of the results being due only to chance and not from any real relationships found in the data.

All of the Pearson r values were statistically significant for the general managers and program directors. Development directors scores realized three nonsignificant coefficients. Those measures not proven to be statistically significant involved strategies pertaining to Audience Focus, Consistency, and Commitment.

Table 17

Correlations of Import and Usage Scores:
Positioning Strategy by Administrative Group

Strategy	General Managers		Program Directors		Development Directors	
	r	P	r	P	r	P
1 Audience	.678	.000*	.585	.000*	.119	.515
2 Competition	.790	.000*	.637	.000*	.568	.001*
3 Market Niche	.899	.000*	.610	.000*	.562	.001*
4 Consistency	.405	.022*	.722	.000*	.137	.453
5 Simplicity	.749	.000*	.745	.000*	.418	.017*
6 Commitment	.534	.002*	.472	.006*	.146	.426

* indicates significant at P<.05, two-tailed.

Inspection of the size of the coefficients also suggested moderately high association between the import and usage scores, the majority falling within the .51 to .75 range. According to guidelines set forth by Champion (1981), the strength of such correlations are generally recognized as good in social and behavioral science research. Coefficients of correlation from the general managers group were the strongest and from the development directors group the weakest.

Based on the data obtained from the Pearson correlation coefficients, there was sufficient evidence to support the rejection of null Hypothesis Four.

Research Question Three

> Is the use of positioning in university-licensed public radio stations associated with higher cumulative audience ratings, greater contributing membership size, and larger percentage of financial budget allocated for advertising and promotional activities?

The telephone survey instrument administered to the 96 university-licensed public radio station administrators supplied the positioning usage data required to answer the third research question. In this instance, individual responses to survey items observed on the dichotomous practice scale were grouped according to institutional/ station affiliation, rather than administrative classification. Every person's responses to the 29 items were summed in each strategy category to form six usage

measures. Positioning usage by administrators of each public radio station--as a separate unit of analysis--was determined by calculating the average sum for each of their six scores. The following provides a brief description of these units of analysis.

The 96 administrators represented 45 public radio stations housed on college campuses located in 21 states throughout the United States. As identified by call letters beginning with "W", 20 stations (44%) were situated in states east of the Mississippi River, and 25 stations (56%) having call letters starting with "K" were in states west of this standard FCC dividing line. Thirty-seven of the 45 stations (82%) were affiliated with public four-year state universities, and the remaining eight (18%) were licensed to public two-year community colleges. Both types of institutions are referred to as "university" licensees.

The practice of positioning within the 45 organizations was discovered to be widespread. Overall, administrators declared employing an average of 18.58 of the 29 strategies and tactics (64%) presented on the survey instrument. When the strategies and their related tactics were summed, the six mean scores of the administrators could be examined according to thematic utilization. The figures listed below are averages of the total number of positioning methods reportedly used, followed in parenthesis by the total number possible on the survey.

1 Audience Focus ----- 4.60 (7)

2 Competition Focus -- 2.00 (5)

3 Market Niche ------- 2.82 (4)

4 Consistency -------- 3.67 (5)

5 Simplicity --------- 2.31 (3)

6 Commitment --------- 3.18 (5)

Cumulative audience ratings were available for 36 of the 45 stations represented in the study. The other nine stations were based in small markets where professional audience rating surveys by Arbitron, Inc. were not conducted. The largest cumulative audience rating registered for these 36 stations was 15.3, the smallest was 0.5, and the mean was 5.8. This can be interpreted generally as meaning that each week during the measurement period (Spring 1988), the typical university-licensed public radio station in the sample was reaching approximately 5.8% of its potential listening audience.

Contributing membership size was reported by the administrators for 44 of the 45 stations represented in the research. Membership figures were then transformed into percentages of listening population within the Total Survey Area (TSA), based on Arbitron market data listed in the Broadcasting/Cablecasting Yearbook (1988) and processed by the Radio Research Consortium, Inc. Market populations served by the stations ranged from 3.5 million people to less than 100,000 individuals, age 12 and older. Knowledge

the cumulative audience ratings and population size was requisite in order to calculate membership percentages for meaningful comparisons. Therefore, only the 36 stations which were located in markets rated by Arbitron could be included in the statistical analysis involving membership size. The management of one station indicated that their university licensee prohibited fundraising, so they had no contributing members, reducing this particular sample to 35.

The largest percentage of membership calculated for the 35 stations was 27.8%, the smallest was 4.4%, and the mean was 10.2%. Basically, this can be interpreted as meaning that the typical university-licensed public radio station in the sample succeeded in converting approximately 10.2% of its listening audience into contributors, actualized by membership.

Percentage of budget allocated for advertising and promotional activities was reported by the administrators for 44 of the 45 stations represented in the study. The largest budget percentage revealed was 13%, the smallest was zero, and the mean was 2.7%. Participants from one-quarter of the organizations indicated that they had no financial budget at all for advertising/promotion.

Research Question Three was addressed further by the statistical testing of Hypotheses Five, Six, and Seven.

Test of Hypothesis Five

HO_5: There is no relationship between cumulative audience ratings and the use of positioning in selected university-licensed public radio stations.

Multiple regression analysis was applied to determine if there was a statistically significant relationship between cumulative audience ratings of 36 university-licensed public radio stations in the research sample and utilization of positioning techniques by the administrators of those stations. In the test of this hypothesis, cumulative audience rating was the dependent variable (labeled Y) and the six positioning usage measures were the independent variables (labeled X's)--Audience Focus, Competition Focus, Market Niche, Consistency, Simplicity, and Commitment. The statistical formula tested was expressed as

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6$$

The purpose of the multivariate regression was to find out if station ratings might be predicted from knowledge of the extent of positioning usage by administrators, and to draw inferences about the population values based on the sample results.

Three different computer procedures were employed to construct the regression model--forward entry, stepwise selection, and force entry. In the forward method, the independent variables were entered into the equation one at a time, the first having the largest correlation with the

dependent variable. The F-test was then calculated for the hypothesis that the coefficient of the entered variable was zero. Variables were added to the equation as they met established criteria involving the F-statistic, which demanded a minimum F-value of 3.84 and associated probability of .05. In this case, the first variable selected for entry did not meet the criteria for inclusion. Therefore, the procedure was terminated with no variables in the equation.

Stepwise selection combined the entry requirements of the forward procedures with additional criteria for sequential removal of variables from the equation. Independent variables were entered separately into the formula, then examined for a minimum F-value of 2.71 and maximum associated probability of .10 to meet in order to remain in the model. As variables were eliminated at each step, the equation was recomputed until no more independent variables could be removed and no more were eligible for entry. Limits were reached on the initial entry, so the process was terminated with no variables in the equation.

The forced entry method generated the only noteworthy output from the regression analysis. In this procedure, all independent variables were entered in a single step in order of decreasing tolerance. Tolerance is defined as the proportion of the variance of a variable in the equation that is not accounted for by the other independent variables (Norusis, 1986).

Table 18 displays the positioning strategy variables in order of decreasing tolerance, their respective nonstandardized regression coefficients (B-values), individual beta weights or standardized regression coefficients (β-values), plus other equation statistics produced by forced entry of all variables in the equation. The overall model was not statistically significant at the .05 alpha level, as revealed by the squared multiple regression coefficient of .19. Examination of the six positioning variables suggested that practice of Competition Focus and Market Niche strategies and accompanying tactics may contribute most to prediction of cumulative audience ratings, while use of Audience Focus may contribute the least. However, none of the six individual usage scores were statistically significant when tested in this manner.

Follow-up analysis was performed with assistance of the Pearson correlation statistical test. The six positioning usage measures were combined to form one total use score per unit for the 36 cases, and use was correlated with the cumulative audience ratings figures. A correlation coefficient of .17 was achieved and associated probability of .16, which was not statistically significant at the .05 alpha level. The small coefficient does not necessarily indicate lack of association between positioning practice and ratings. Instead, it means that a linear relationship between the two variables is questionable. The Pearson r

Table 18

Prediction of Cumulative Audience Ratings From Positioning Usage: Strategy by Multiple Regression Statistics

Strategy	B	Beta
6 Commitment	.44	.15
1 Audience Focus	-.02	.00
5 Simplicity	.16	.04
3 Market Niche	-1.34	-.38
2 Competition Focus	.89	.39
4 Consistency	.04	.02

Intercept = 58.86,
Multiple R = .43, R Square = .19,
Adjusted R Square = .02,
F = 1.12, Significance of F = .38,
not significant at P<.05.

served to supplement and confirm the findings of the multiple regression model.

Based on data obtained from the multiple regression analysis and Pearson r follow-up test, there was insufficient evidence to support the rejection of null Hypothesis Five and it was retained. However, these results should be regarded as inconclusive, since there is a possibility that the statistical nonsignificance observed in this case could be reversed in subsequent testing.

Test of Hypothesis Six

HO_6: There is no relationship between contributing membership size and use of positioning in selected university-licensed public radio stations.

Multiple regression analysis was applied to determine if there was a statistically significant relationship between contributing membership size of 35 university-licensed public radio stations in the research sample and utilization of positioning techniques by administrators of those stations. In the test of this hypothesis, membership was the dependent variable and the six positioning usage measures of the administrators were the independent variables.

The three computer procedures described previously in the test of Hypothesis Five were employed again to build the regression equations for Hypothesis Six. Similarly, the forward entry and stepwise selection methods both failed to

produce a regression model with the variables under consideration.

The force entry procedure did succeed in generating the regression statistics displayed in Table 19. The six separate positioning variables, listed in order of decreasing tolerance, and the overall model were not statistically significant at the .05 alpha level.

Follow-up analysis was performed with the Pearson correlation statistical test in the same manner as explained in the previous hypothesis. A negative correlation coefficient of -.08 was achieved and associated probability of .31, which was not statistically significant at the .05 alpha level. Again, the Pearson r provided additional information and corroborated the findings of the multiple regression model.

Based on data obtained from the multiple regression analysis and Pearson r follow-up test, there was insufficient evidence to support the rejection of null Hypothesis Six and it was retained. However, these results should be regarded as inconclusive. Further observations and testing may contradict the evidence presented in this specific demonstration.

Table 19

Prediction of Membership Size
From Positioning Usage: Strategy by
Multiple Regression Statistics

Strategy	B	Beta
6 Commitment	.41	.08
1 Audience Focus	.97	.22
5 Simplicity	.96	.14
3 Market Niche	-1.02	-.17
2 Competition Focus	-.69	-.17
4 Consistency	-.28	-.08

Intercept = 73.23,
Multiple R = .29, R Square = .09,
Adjusted R Square = -.10,
F = 0.49, Significance of F = .82,
not significant at P<.05.

Test of Hypothesis Seven

HO_7: There is no relationship between percentage of financial budget allocated for advertising/promotional activities and the use of positioning in selected university-licensed public radio stations.

Multiple regression analysis was applied to determine if there was a statistically significant relationship between advertising/promotional budget allocations of 44 university-licensed public radio stations in the research sample and utilization of positioning techniques by administrators of those stations. In this particular test, advertising budget was the dependent variable and the six strategy measures of the administrators were the independent variables.

The same three computer procedures detailed previously in Hypothesis Five and Six were employed in the construction of multiple regression models to test the present hypothesis. The stepwise selection method generated a statistically significant equation containing only one of the six independent variables. The Commitment variable was entered on the first step and passed all requirements for admittance to and retention in the formula. The Commitment scores produced data such as a .935 regression coefficient and .291 beta, a multiple R of .291, an R squared of .085 and adjusted R squared of .064, an F-value of 4.18 and associated probability of .05, which was statistically significant at that chosen critical level. The five other

positioning variables were not included in the equation. The result was the following succinct but meaningful expression:

Y = -.298 + .935 x Strategy 6 measures.

The forced entry method also built a multiple regression model with the figures presented in Table 20, but it was not statistically significant overall at the .05 alpha level. Displayed in order of decreasing tolerance, the six individual positioning variables' beta weights pointed again to Commitment as making the largest contribution. Usage of the Consistency strategy and related tactics apparently contributed the least to prediction of advertising/promotional budget allocations.

Follow-up analysis was performed with the Pearson correlation statistical test in the same format outlined in the two previous hypotheses. A correlation coefficient of .22 was achieved and associated probability of .07, which was not statistically significant at the .05 level. The Pearson r served to augment and substantiate the multiple regression models.

Based on data obtained from the multiple regression analysis and Pearson r follow-up test, there was insufficient evidence to support the rejection of null Hypothesis Seven and it was retained. However, these results should be regarded as inconclusive, particularly in light of the individual significance attached to one of the

Table 20

Prediction of Advertising/Promotion Budget From Positioning Usage: Strategy by Multiple Regression Statistics

Strategy	B	Beta
6 Commitment	1.49	.46
1 Audience Focus	.76	.35
5 Simplicity	.52	.13
3 Market Niche	.09	.02
2 Competition Focus	-.09	-.04
4 Consistency	-.71	-.34

Intercept = 2.99,
Multiple R = .48, R Square = .23,
Adjusted R Square = .12,
F = 2.04, Significance of F = .08,
not significant at P<.05.

six positioning variables. Later experiments may challenge the currently available evidence offered herein.

Summary

Chapter IV has contained a presentation of the data which resulted from implementation of two survey instruments and from collection of other pertinent information in order to answer systematically three research questions and seven associated hypotheses. Descriptive replies to the inquiries and statistical hypothesis testing were provided to explore the utility of Ries and Trout's market positioning theory to those in university management responsible for campus-based public radio stations.

The descriptive analyses contained narratives about the verification process of the theoretically-derived positioning strategies and tactics by expert opinion, plus the nature of the administrative sample and their representative units drawn for the study.

Hypothesis testing involved the use of two nonparametric statistical procedures: the chi-square test of independence and Cramer's V correlation coefficient. Three parametric statistical processes were employed as well: one-way analysis of variance, Pearson produce-moment correlation coefficient, and multiple regression analysis.

Some significant relationships were demonstrated between perceived importance and practice of the market positioning techniques by experts and administrators. Some

differences were observed between types of administrators in terms of their import and usage ratings. Linear associations between positioning use and cumulative audience ratings, station membership, and advertising/promotional budget allocations were not definitively proven by this particular set of data assembled for study.

Interpretation and summary of the results are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, INTERPRETATION, DISCUSSION IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Introduction

The intent of this chapter is to provide 1) a brief recapitulation of the study by summarizing the research problem, rationale, methods, and findings; 2) interpretation of results, followed sequentially by conclusions in connection with the research questions and accompanying hypotheses; 3) a discussion of research findings in relation to the utility of market positioning theory; 4) implications of the study; and 5) recommendations for additional research endeavors.

Summary of the Research Study

The Research Problem

The purpose of the research study was to investigate the utility of Ries and Trout's marketing-based positioning theory for administrators who operate public radio stations licensed to institutions of higher education. The utility of the positioning theory was measured by expert opinion, practitioner usage, and specific outcome variables. The operationalized principles which comprise the theory were

rated initially by a panel of experts in public broadcasting management and only those deemed important for use in public radio were retained for further examination in the collegiate setting. The following questions were of particular concern:

1. What importance is placed upon Ries and Trout's positioning strategies and tactics by a panel of experts and to what extent are they being utilized in public radio?

2. What importance is placed upon the expert-verified positioning strategies and tactics by selected administrators and to what extent are they being utilized in university-licensed public radio stations?

3. Is the use of positioning in university-licensed public radio stations associated with higher cumulative audience ratings, greater contributing membership size, and larger percentage of financial budget allocated for advertising and promotional activities?

In the course of the study, the following seven hypotheses stemming from the three research questions were tested as well:

HO_1. There is no relationship between the experts' ratings of the degree of importance and use of the positioning strategies and tactics in public radio stations.

HO_2. There is no difference between university station administrators classified as general managers, program directors, and development directors with regard to degree

of importance assigned to the positioning strategies and tactics.

HO_3. There is no difference between university station administrators classified as general managers, program directors, and development directors with regard to use of the positioning strategies and tactics.

HO_4. There is no relationship between the degree of importance assigned to and use of the positioning strategies and tactics by the three administrative groups.

HO_5. There is no relationship between cumulative audience ratings and the use of positioning in selected university-licensed public radio stations.

HO_6. There is no relationship between contributing membership size and the use of positioning in selected university-licensed public radio stations.

HO_7. There is no relationship between percentage of financial budget allocated for advertising/promotional activities and the use of positioning in selected university-licensed public radio stations.

The Research Rationale

The need for the research study was justified on the basis of the following six points: 1) the need to assuage the historical rift between educators and broadcasters; 2) a deficiency of radio research; 3) past neglect of educational broadcasting; 4) lingering confusion regarding the purpose and identity of public radio; 5) the increasing

significance of market positioning to nonprofit organizations, particularly higher education; and 6) the lack of market positioning research applicable to higher education and broadcasting.

The Research Method

Procedures for conducting the research study involved related literature review, development of two survey instruments, pilot testing, data collection from experts, administrators, and documents, data analysis, and presentation of the results.

One research instrument took the form of a written questionnaire constructed from operationalized market positioning principles theorized by Ries and Trout. A panel of experts comprised of 14 members of the Board of Directors of National Public Radio and American Public Radio judged the positioning methods with respect to their theoretical feasibility in the administration of public radio stations. Those positioning strategies and tactics that were validated by the expert panel majority were included in a second research instrument designed to be a telephone survey. A pilot test was conducted with public radio administrators from six university-licensed stations to determine the appropriateness of the instrument and the testing plan for subsequent implementation within the collegiate environment.

A major portion of the research study consisted of telephone survey interviews with 96 administrators

representing 45 university-licensed , CPB-qualified, Class C public radio stations across the nation. General/ Station Managers, Program Directors, and Development/ Promotion Directors responded in terms of perceived importance and practical usage of the theoretically-derived, expert-verified positioning techniques.

Additional data were compiled in the form of cumulative audience ratings, contributing membership size, and advertising/promotion budget allocations of the 45 campus-based public radio stations represented in the research study.

Statistical analyses of the quantitative data were performed by the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences program using five basic procedures. Relationships between the experts' import and usage ratings were computed through use of chi-squares and Cramer's V correlation coefficients. Differences among administrative group scores were computed by analysis of variance. Relationships between administrators' import and usage ratings were computed by Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients. Relationships between administrators' positioning practice and station audience ratings, membership size, and advertising budget were analyzed by multiple regression.

The Research Findings

Some statistically significant relationships between perceived importance and practice of market positioning were determined from both the experts' and administrators' data sets. Some significant differences were observed among administrative groups in regard to import ratings, but not in usage scores. Statistically significant relationships between cumulative audience ratings, contributing membership size, advertising/promotion budget allocations, and positioning use by administrators, were not proven conclusively.

Interpretation of Results

Experts' Perceptions of Positioning

According to results reported in Chapter IV, experts in public broadcasting management made a very positive assessment of market positioning theory, as evidenced by their overwhelming 91% validation of the theoretically-derived positioning strategies and tactics which comprised the written survey instrument (See Appendix D, Tables 2, 4, 5). The panel declined to verify the importance of comparative advertising, market leader associations, and oversimplification of communication. However, the experts indicated a high degree of receptivity toward all other positioning methods presented to them for consideration in public radio, including the strategy and related tactics with the most obvious competitive connotations.

The judges were also optimistic about the extent of positioning usage in public radio stations, designating three-quarters of the strategies and tactics as currently being practiced (See Tables 3, 5). The majority of positioning procedures thought to be unutilized were deemed important nonetheless and should be implemented.

Conclusions Regarding Research Question One and Hypothesis One

Public broadcasting experts believe that market positioning has value and that it actually is being exercised in public radio today. While statistically significant relationships between perceived import and use were determined for only a few of the itemized positioning methods, examination of the correlation coefficients confirmed most to have moderately high associations (See Table 6). The statistical insignificance was explained by experts who judged many strategies and tactics as important, but then neglected to offer any opinion as to their usage.

Administrators' Perceptions of Positioning

As a whole group, the 96 administrators of university-licensed public radio stations tendered a favorable evaluation of market positioning theory, as portrayed by their strong ratings on the telephone survey instrument containing the theoretically-derived, expert-verified strategies and tactics (See Appendix G, Table 7). Consistency was the most important operationalized principle

from their vantage point, while the notion of competition was the least palatable, although worthy of some focused attention.

In terms of implementation, the administrative majority generally declared nearly three-quarters of the positioning techniques in service at their institutions (See Table 8). But the expert panel held the impression that more positioning strategies and tactics were being used in public radio than practitioners in this sample were willing to affirm. For instance, qualitative research endeavors, narrow target audience aims, and all of the competition-related procedures failed to receive majority usage by administrators in reality, despite experts' assertions about their alleged practice.

Examination of data results by administrative group classification pointed first to Development/Promotion Directors as the most supportive of positioning, in reference to both perceived import and use, followed closely by General/Station Managers, then Program Directors (See Tables 9-16).

Conclusions Regarding Research Question Two and Hypotheses Two, Three, Four

Administrators of college-based public radio stations generally approve of market positioning in theory and, to a large extent, actualize their endorsements by utilizing the strategies and tactics. Statistically significant

differences were determined to exist between development and programming people concerning import perceptions of the overall Consistency theme, and the latter group more reserved in their advocacy than the preceding group. Differences between administrative groups in regard to positioning practice were so small as to be statistically negligible. Relationships between perceived import and use of positioning were also demonstrated in the many statistically significant correlations obtained for all groups (See Table 17). Low correlation coefficients exhibited in half of the Development/Promotion Directors scores were explained by this group's high esteem for positioning coupled with hampered efforts to actually carry out some of the methods they so admire.

Relationships Between Ratings, Membership, Advertising Budget, and Positioning Usage

Based on knowledge of the extent of market positioning usage by administrators of university-licensed public radio stations, might any informed estimations be made concerning their stations' cumulative audience ratings, contributing membership size, or percent of financial budget allocated for advertising/promotional activities? If the relationship between positioning use scores and these individual criterion variables had been high, one would be able to use a regression line to predict ratings, membership, and budget allocations in future samples where such measures are

unknown. Linear regression analysis attempted to find a straight line through the set of data that best fit that particular data. The regression equation assumed that the Y-variable increased proportionably as the X-variables increased.

In the investigation involving cumulative audience ratings, it can be seen in Table 18 that there was a low relationship between positioning use and ratings. If the adjusted R squared (.02) could be considered an estimate of the population correlation, positioning practice by station administrators accounted for two percent of the variance in station audience ratings.

The data displayed in Table 19 can be interpreted as meaning there was a small negative relationship between positioning use and membership. If the adjusted R squared (-.10) could be considered an estimate of the population correlation, positioning practice by station administrators accounted for none of the variance in station membership size.

Table 20 exhibits another low relationship between positioning use and advertising budget, with an adjusted R squared computed to be .12. Positioning practice by station administrators accounted for 12%, or more than one-fifth, of the variance in station budget allocations for advertising and promotional activities. Commitment was the best predictor, and when analyzed for its contribution alone, was

found to be statistically significant. However, when combined with the other positioning scores in a regression equation, the effect of Commitment practice was less striking.

Conclusions Regarding Research Question Three and Hypotheses Five, Six, Seven

There appears to be some association between cumulative audience ratings and positioning use, in view of the fact that the coefficients of determination--R squared and adjusted R squared--were shown to be greater than zero. Nevertheless, the relationship was not statistically significant overall and more than 98% of the variance in ratings is still unaccounted for. There also seems to be some negative association between contributing membership size and positioning usage, yet the relationship was again statistically nonsignificant, leaving all of the observed variability in the data unexplained. Association does seem to exist between advertising budget allocations and positioning use, particularly practice of the Commitment strategy and tactics, which proved to be statistically significant.

The multiple regression equations were fitted to the peculiarities of the data from which they were computed and therefore, their predictive accuracy reflects this chosen research sample.

Discussion

The findings of the data analysis in which a panel of experts in public broadcasting management ratified the theoretically-derived strategies and tactics served to support Ries and Trout's contention that market positioning has potential for application in any human activity that requires mass communication. Furthermore, the fact that the positioning techniques received practitioner affirmation and were evidently employed to such an extent in college-based broadcasting operations, additionally confirms the interdisciplinary nature and transferability of the operationalized principles which comprise the positioning theory.

Many of the administrators who participated in the telephone survey interviews indicated rather recent attention to positioning in terms of having just begun to formulate positioning plans and goals for their stations. Hence the difficulty some individuals had responding accurately on the dichotomous practice scale, increasing the likelihood of distortion to the usage score results. Since many administrators were in various stages of implementation, the full impact of positioning may not be recognized at present. Therefore, the precise utility of market positioning theory to university management responsible for public radio stations has yet to be established absolutely. This initial research effort to

investigate its usefulness should be regarded as exploratory in nature rather than terminal. As time proceeds and more evidence accumulates, tentative conclusions regarding positioning as reported herein will become more certain.

No previous research precedents on this topic were available to dictate the methodological decisions made by the researcher. While the standard .05 probability level was chosen for hypothesis testing, as is generally accepted for research in education, interpretation of the results would have been altered significantly had a higher level been selected. Roscoe (1975) has held that it is permissible to test hypotheses at the .10 or even .20 alpha level when one is working with new ideas, the loss of which could be crucial if Type II error occurs in the research and a false hypothesis is retained.

In regard to the multiple regression analysis conducted in the test of Hypotheses 5-7, the lurking question remains as to what other factors may have greater influence upon cumulative audience ratings, contributing membership size, and advertising/promotion budget allocations, since positioning usage was found to have had such low predictive value. Perhaps type of programming format, market size, degree of station identification with the university licensee, and audience demographics/psychographics may contribute to more exact estimation of these criterion variables.

Two unanticipated and disturbing inconsistencies were uncovered in the course of the telephone survey interviews with the administrative groups. First, station managers, program and development directors who worked together often provided contradictory testimony regarding usage of the positioning techniques at their stations. Whereas it was expected that these three types of administrators would not all hold the same opinions in reference to import of the strategies and tactics, incongruency in reported practice within the administrative units was not expected.

The second inconsistency dealt with revelation of a philosophy that apparently is still entrenched in the mentality of many who hold the responsibility to administer public radio. It is characterized by a passive attitude that assumes audiences will take the initiative to seek out certain stations on the radio dial without any additional incentives or efforts on the part of station management. In other words, "Let them find us" is the operating principle, bordering on outright indifference toward the audience. Such a philosophy is totally inconsistent with public radio's service mission as outlined by the Carnegie Commission in 1979, as well as with the practice of sound positioning strategy. Ultimately, insensitivity to listeners will also prove to be detrimental to the CPB's ambitious goal of doubling the size of the public radio audience by 1991.

Implications

On the basis of the market positioning research conducted with public broadcasting experts and administrators of university-licensed public radio stations, there are implications that can be stated.

1. Academic leaders should require three-year market positioning plans from administrators of campus-based public radio stations, plus follow-up evaluations to ensure that the goals are being met.

2. Market positioning applications should be investigated as having potential to enhance other university service functions.

3. Station administrators indicated repeatedly a qualitative research deficiency due to the prohibitive expense of conducting such studies. Research capabilities inherent to universities might be tapped for this purpose, with assistance from advertising/marketing classes and graduate student projects of mutual benefit.

4. Station administrators should recognize the need for inter-office communication to demonstrate a more uniform positioning agenda, including unified means and methods of approaching the positioning goals.

5. The "hide-and-seek" philosophy should be expunged if audience needs are to be served effectively by university-license public radio stations.

6. Administrators of university-licensed public radio stations located in markets where audience ratings are not conducted might examine alternatives to find out how they rank, such as proposing university-facilitated research studies. Administrators of stations in ranked markets which do not receive the audience data should make an effort to subscribe in order to learn how well they are serving potential audiences.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the results of this study, need for further research is indicated in the following areas.

1. A study should be conducted utilizing the developed research instruments in applications testing a wider range of groups within educational institutions, as well as including management of different classes of campus-based broadcasting facilities.

2. A study should be conducted to determine what other predictor variables are associated with cumulative audience ratings, contributing membership size, advertising and promotion budget allocations.

3. A study should be conducted to determine the influence of institutional image upon market positioning of university-license public radio stations.

4. A study should be conducted to determine the correlation between positioning usage by station administrators and audience time spent listening data.

5. A study should be conducted to determine if positioning usage by station administrators might be correlated differently with audience data produced by Birch Radio, Inc. instead of that used from Arbitron, Inc.

6. This study should be replicated controlling for market size.

7. This study should be replicated in 1991 to determine the market positioning progress of university-licensed public radio stations.

8. This study should be replicated after 1999 to determine if a decade of market positioning practice has altered the mission and identity of university-licensed public radio stations.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF POSITIONING STRATEGIES AND TACTICS

1. Appeal to psychology of listeners; communicate how station satisfies needs and desires. (Reymer & Gersin, 1983; Steinberg, 1986)
2. Select audience segment to serve and program their preferences. (Blume, 1983; Eastman, Head, & Klein, 1985; Mitchell, 1971; Reymer & Gersin, 1983; Ted Bolton Associates, 1984)
3. Capture one or more narrow demographic groups; highly focused targeting. (Eastman et al., 1985; Roth, 1983)
4. Monitor changing characteristics and attitudes of target audience. (Blume, 1983; Quaal & Brown, 1976)
5. Examine competitors' audience and programming. (Blume, 1983; Eastman et al., 1985; Johnson & Jones, 1978)
6. Provide counterprogramming; fill the void. (Blume, 1983, Johnson & Jones, 1978; Reymer & Gersin, 1983; Williams, 1981)
7. Program against weakest station or signal. (Williams, 1981)
8. Consistency of programming key to success. (Whitney, 1985)
9. Fight competition in listeners' minds. (Reymer & Gersin, 1983)
10. Create image by anonymous music rotation. (Gold, 1982)
11. Offer extended commercial-free broadcasting. (Gold, 1982)
12. Measure positioning success by change in consumers' perceptions toward brand relative to competing brands. (Smith & Lusch, 1976)
13. Identify, clarify, and/or strengthen existing identity. (Berry, 1982; Cravens, 1975; Margulies, 1981; McKenna, 1985; Quaal & Brown, 1976)
14. Analyze current strengths and weaknesses. (Eastman et al., 1985; Geibel, 1986; Margulies, 1981; McKenna, 1985)
15. Increase advertising expenditures. (Repositioning, 1980)
16. Reinforce users' perceptions while appealing to nonusers. (Gallanis, 1985)
17. Aim at small, precisely defined customer targets with products tailored to needs. (Aaker & Shansby, 1982; Baumwoll, 1984; Kotler & Levy, 1969; McKenna, 1985; Meyers, 1984; Saunders, 1981; Springer, 1972)

18. Represent one quality or benefit. (Baumwoll, 1984; Ogilvy, 1971)
19. Goals must be understood and supported by all employees. (Berry, 1982; Johnson & Jones, 1978; Margulies, 1980; McKenna, 1985; Quaal & Brown, 1976)
20. Develop new markets; create bigger pie rather than bigger slice. (McKenna, 1985; Ted Bolton Associates, 1984)
21. Build relationship with key people in field. (Kotler, 1986; McKenna, 1985)
22. Understand customers' thinking, behavior, motivations, perceptions, lifestyles; psychographics. (Aaker & Shansby, 1982; Eastman et al., 1985; Ennis, 1982; Foltz, 1985; Hedges, 1986; Kotler & Levy, 1969; Meyers, 1984; McKenna, 1985; Ogilvy, 1971; Springer, 1972; Wademan, 1976; Zotti, 1985)
23. Conduct internal audits; "know thyself". (Cravens, 1975; Kotler & Levy, 1969; Margulies, 1981; McKenna, 1985)
24. Conduct external audits of market environment. (Cravens, 1975; McKenna, 1985; Rados, 1981)
25. Adjust to changes in market conditions. (Cravens, 1975; McKenna, 1985; Rados, 1981)
26. Identify market niche. (Berry, 1982; Blume, 1983; Cravens, 1975; Geibel, 1986; Johnson & Jones, 1978; Margulies, 1980; McKenna, 1985; Montana, 1978; Ted Bolton Associates, 1984)
27. Position against weakest opponent. (Reeves, 1981)
28. Respond quickly to competitive moves. (McKenna, 1985)
29. Use comparative advertising. (Aaker & Shansby, 1982; Fox, 1985)
30. Study the competition. (Aaker & Shansby, 1982; Eastman et al., 1985; Geibel, 1986; Johnson & Jones, 1978; Margulies, 1981; McKenna, 1985; Rados, 1981; Saunders, 1981)
31. Increase efforts to obtain qualitative research data. (Aaker & Shansby, 1982; McKenna, 1985; Quaal & Brown, 1976)
32. Create product position based on attributes, quality, competitor, application, user, or class. (Aaker & Shansby, 1982; Ennis, 1982; Ogilvy, 1971)
33. Communicate product benefits. (Ogilvy, 1971; Saunders, 1981)
34. Select unique selling propositions to generate maximum sales. (Reeves, 1981)
35. Present consistent image; don't change what works. (Aaker & Shansby, 1982; Baumwoll, 1984; Berry, 1982; Ogilvy, 1971; Warwick & Sands, 1975)
36. Establish credibility with customers. (McKenna, 1985)
37. Form alliances with other companies. (Kotler, 1986)
38. Customize product/service to suit individual. (Klein, 1985; Meyers, 1984)

39. Decide position before executing advertising. (Ogilvy, 1971; Reeves, 1981; Rosenfeld, Sirowitz, & Lawson, 1971)
40. Purify ideas and statements in advertising messages; use repetition. (Altschiller, 1986; Geibel, 1986; MacLachlan, 1984; Ogilvy, 1971; Ogilvy & Raphaelson, 1982; Wademan, 1976)
41. Establish long-term commitment to research and strategic planning. (Johnson & Jones, 1978; Quaal & Brown, 1976; Ted Bolton Associates, 1984)

APPENDIX B

PANEL OF EXPERTS

Douglas J. Bennet, Jr.
President
National Public Radio
Washington, DC

Patricia Deal Cahill
General Manager
KCUR-FM
Kansas City, MO

G. Gibson Carey IV
Vice President
Proctor & Gamble
Cincinnati, OH

Ward B. Chamberlin, Jr.
President & General Manager
WETA-FM
Arlington, VA

Kathryn P. Jensen
General Manager
WCPN-FM
Cleveland, OH

Jack W. Mitchell
Director of Radio and
Station Manager, WHA-AM
Madison, WI

Dale K. Ouzts
General Manager
WOSU-AM/FM/TV
Columbus, OH

Wayne C. Roth
General Manager
WUOW-FM
Seattle, WA

Joan G. Rubel
General Manager
WFCR-FM
Amherst, MA

Ann Santen
Programming Manager
WGUC-FM
Cincinnati, OH

Wallace Smith
Vice President
WNYC-AM/FM
New York, NY

Jennifer Stanley
Maplehurst
Oxford, MD

Douglas Vernier
General Manager
KHKE/KUNI-FM
Cedar Falls, IA

Max Wycisk
General Manager
KCFR-FM
Denver, CO

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER TO PANEL OF EXPERTS

June 10, 1988

Dear _____:

I am a doctoral student at the University of Florida and am conducting a study of market positioning strategies and tactics utilized by public radio stations. "Positioning" is the process of creating an image of a radio station in the minds of prospective listeners. It involves making the audience believe that one station is really different from others in the market. In light of the continuing proliferation of new communication channels, an immediate need exists to strengthen the identity of public radio and promote a unique image that will compel audiences to seek it out on the dial.

As a member of the Board of Directors of NPR/APR, your opinion on the subject of public radio station positioning is vital. I ask for your cooperation in sharing with me some information that will be used in a confidential manner to complete my Ph.D. dissertation and contribute some new insights to the field. The final outcome of the research will be a set of practical recommendations to public broadcasting administrators for enhancing the market position of their radio stations.

The enclosed survey should take a minimum of your time. A postage-paid envelope is provided, so I hope to hear from you by return mail today. All responses will be kept strictly anonymous and will be combined with others for general analysis.

Thank you for your help and interest in improving the position of public radio. Your reply will definitely make a difference.

Sincerely,

Carolyn E. Poole
Research Assistant
Institute of Higher Education

APPENDIX D

WRITTEN POSITIONING SURVEY INSTRUMENT

This survey is intended to measure your perceptions as to the importance of specific strategies and tactics an administrator might implement to position a public radio station. For the purpose of this survey, positioning will be defined in terms of creating an image of a radio station in the minds of prospective listeners. Listed below are six general strategies (in capital letters), followed by several tactics for achieving those objectives. Please rate how important you feel these strategies and tactics are, and if you believe they are currently being used in public radio stations. Thank you very much.

Carolyn E. Poole
University of Florida

The rating scale is:
1 - not important
2 - below average importance
3 - average importance
4 - above average importance
5 - extremely important

		(circle one) Degree of Importance	(circle one) Is this Practiced?
1.	FOCUS ON THE AUDIENCE		
A.	Conduct qualitative research of audience perceptions & opinions of the station.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
B.	Direct programming to a narrow target audience.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
C.	Identify what listeners believe are strengths of the station.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No

		(circle one) Degree of Importance	(circle one) Is this Practiced?
D.	Identify what listeners believe are weaknesses of the station.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
E.	Determine how listeners rank one's station in comparison to others.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
F.	Relate programming to something audience is familiar with.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
2.	FOCUS ON THE COMPETITION	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
A.	Evaluate strengths of competing stations.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
B.	Evaluate weaknesses of competing stations.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
C.	Exploit weaknesses of competing stations.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
D.	Avoid direct competition with the market leader.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
E.	Refer to other stations by name in one's own promos and advertising.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
3.	FIND A MARKET NICHE TO FILL.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
A.	Be first in the market to program a particular format.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
B.	Fill a hole in the market by offering alternative programming.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
C.	Create a new market niche based on audience lifestyle preferences.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No

		(circle one) Degree of Importance	(circle one) Is this Practiced?
D.	Associate one's programming with the market leader.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
4.	REQUIRE CONSISTENCY THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE POSITIONING PLAN.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
A.	Select station name and slogans that accurately describe the programming format.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
B.	Develop advertising and promotional campaigns that match the intended position.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
C.	Assure positioning objectives set the direction for all station activities.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
D.	Reinforce position by use of repetition.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
5.	STRIVE FOR SIMPLICITY IN ALL COMMUNICATIONS	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
A.	Use obvious ideas and simple words in a straightforward manner.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
B.	Modify complex messages by restraining creative techniques.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
C.	Oversimplify messages in order to make long-lasting impressions.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
6.	ESTABLISH LONG-TERM COMMITMENT TO THE POSITIONING OBJECTIVE.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No

		(circle one) Degree of Importance	(circle one) Is this Practiced?
A.	Determine a basic position and adhere to it, changing only the short-term tactics.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
B.	Decide long-range (5-10 year) positioning goals.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
C.	Allocate a sufficiently large budget for advertising and promotional activities.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No
D.	Enlist support and understanding of entire station staff in promoting positioning goals.	1 2 3 4 5	Yes No

Please return in enclosed envelope by June 20, 1988

Mail to: C. E. Poole, 719 Oakview Dr. WWS
Bradenton, FL 34210

APPENDIX E

INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO STATION ADMINISTRATORS

August 5, 1988

Dear _____:

I am a doctoral student at the University of Florida and conducting a study of market positioning strategies and tactics utilized by public radio stations. "Positioning" is the process of creating an image of a radio station in the minds of prospective listeners. It involves making the audience believe that one station is really different from others in the market. In light of the continuing proliferation of new communication channels, an immediate need exists to strengthen the identity of public radio and promote a unique image that will compel audiences to seek out on the dial.

I ask for your support and cooperation in sharing with me your opinion on the subject of public radio station positioning. The information will be used in a confidential manner to complete my dissertation and contribute some new insights to the field. A summary of this practical research will be available as a service to you upon completion of the project.

The survey will be conducted by telephone and should take only a few minutes of your time. Please indicate on the enclosed form a date when it would be convenient for you to be contacted by phone. A postage-paid reply envelope is provided, so I hope to hear from you by return mail today. Also enclosed is a list of some proposed positioning strategies and tactics for your consideration in advance of the survey call.

Thank you for your help and interest in improving the position of public radio. I look forward to talking with you soon. Your response will definitely make a difference.

Sincerely,

Carolyn E. Poole
Research Assistant
719 Oakview Drive WWS
Bradenton, FL 34210

APPENDIX F

TELEPHONE SURVEY CONFIRMATION FORM

I agree to participate in the market positioning survey.
THE BEST TIME TO CALL ME IS: (check first & second preferences)

_____WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 17 _____MONDAY, AUGUST 22
_____THURSDAY, AUGUST 18 _____TUESDAY, AUGUST 23
_____FRIDAY, AUGUST 19 _____WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 24

_____morning? _____afternoon? _____evening?

(Please print:)

NAME _____

TITLE _____

STATION _____

PHONE _____

Please also supply the following information, which will be analyzed only in ways that GUARANTEE individual, station, & institutional confidentiality.

HOW MANY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS/SUBSCRIBERS (e.g., "Friends of 89FM") CURRENTLY SUPPORT YOUR STATION? _____

HOW MUCH DOES YOUR STATION SPEND ANNUALLY FOR ADVERTISING AND PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES? (dollar amount) _____

(percent of total budget) _____

Thank you! Return TODAY to:
C.E. Poole, 719 Oakview Drive WWS, Bradenton, Florida 34210

APPENDIX G

TELEPHONE POSITIONING SURVEY INSTRUMENT

This is a proposed list of positioning strategies and tactics an administrator might implement to position a public radio station. I will ask you on the phone to rate the degree of importance of each item on a scale of 1-5, and will also ask if these positioning strategies and tactics are currently being practiced at your public radio station. The rating scale will be:

1 - not important
2 - below average importance
3 - average
4 - above average importance
5 - extremely important

---

1. Focus on the audience.
2. Conduct qualitative research of audience perceptions and opinions of station.
3. Direct programming to a narrow target audience.
4. Identify what listeners believe are strengths of the station.
5. Identify what listeners believe are weaknesses of the station.
6. Determine how listeners rank your station in comparison to others in the market.
7. Relate programming to something audience is familiar with.
8. Focus on the competition.
9. Evaluate strengths of competing stations.
10. Evaluate weaknesses of competing stations.

11. Exploit weaknesses of competing stations.

12. Avoid direct competition with the market leader.

13. Find a market niche to fill.

14. Be first in the market to program a particular format.

15. Fill a hole in market by offering alternative programming.

16. Create a new market niche based on audience lifestyle preferences.

17. Require consistency throughout the entire positioning plan.

18. Select station name and slogans that accurately describe the programming format.

19. Develop advertising and promotional campaigns that match the intended position.

20. Assure positioning objectives set the direction for all station activities.

21. Reinforce position by use of repetition.

22. Strive for simplicity in all communications.

23. Use obvious ideas and simple words in straightforward manner.

24. Modify complex messages by restraining creative techniques.

25. Establish long-term commitment to the positioning objective.

26. Determine a basic position and adhere to it, changing only the short-term tactics.

27. Decide long-range (5-10 year) positioning goals.

28. Allocate a sufficiently large budget for advertising and promotional activities.

29. Enlist support and understanding of entire station staff in promoting the positioning goals.

APPENDIX H

TELEPHONE SURVEY INTRODUCTION

Hello, this is Carolyn Poole from the University of Florida. I'm calling in regard to the positioning study you agreed to participate in. Is this a convenient time for you to talk with me now for a few minutes? (reschedule or proceed)

The study focuses on positioning techniques used at public radio stations operated by colleges and universities. For the purpose of our discussion, I'll define positioning as the practice of communicating to the audience certain images of your station that make it different from all the rest.

Did you receive in the mail a list of some positioning strategies and tactics? Would you like to refer to that copy, if it's handy? . . .

There are six basic positioning strategies, followed by several tactics for achieving those objectives. I'm going to ask for your opinion on the degree of importance of each strategy and tactic. Please rate these on a scale of one to five. One means "not important." Two, "below average importance." Three indicates "average importance." Four, "above average importance," And Five rates "extremely important."

I am also going to ask you if these positioning strategies and tactics are currently being used at your station. You may reply with a simple "yes" or "no" to those questions.

All information you offer me will remain strictly confidential and your responses will be combined with others for general analysis. Your name, station, and institution will be kept anonymous.

Do you have any questions before we begin?...

(Start survey)

APPENDIX I

UNIVERSITY LICENSEES REPRESENTED IN THE TELEPHONE SURVEY

STATION	LICENSEE	CITY, STATE
WTSU-FM	Troy State University	Montgomery, AL
WUAL-FM	University of Alabama	Tuscaloosa, AL
KJZZ-FM	Maricopa Community College	Phoenix, AZ
KUNC-FM	University of Northern Colorado	Greeley, CO
WUSF-FM	University of South Florida	Tampa, FL
WQCS-FM	Indian River Community College	Fort Pierce, FL
WKGC-FM	Gulf Coast Community College	Panama City, FL
WUWF-FM	University of West Florida	Pensacola, FL
WILL-FM	University of Illinois	Urbana, IL
WOI-FM	Iowa State University	Ames, IA
KUNI-FM	University of Northern Iowa	Cedar Falls, IA
KIWR-FM	Iowa Western Community College	Council Blfs, IA
KSUI-FM	University of Iowa	Iowa City, IA
KWIT-FM	W. Iowa Tech Community College	Sioux City, IA
KHCC-FM	Hutchinson Community College	Hutchinson, KS
KANU-FM	University of Kansas	Lawrence, KS
KMUW-FM	Wichita State University	Wichita, KS
WKYU-FM	Western Kentucky University	Bowling Green,KY
WKMS-FM	Murray State University	Murray, KY
KDAQ-FM	Louisiana State University	Shreveport, LA
WUOM-FM	University of Michigan	Ann Arbor, MI
WDET-FM	Wayne State University	Detroit, MI
WKAR-FM	Michigan State University	E. Lansing, MI
WNMU-FM	Northern Michigan University	Marquette, MI
KUMD-FM	University of Minnesota	Duluth, MN
KBIA-FM	University of Missouri	Columbia, MO
KCUR-FM	University of Missouri	Kansas City, MO
KXCV-FM	N.W. Missouri State University	Maryville, MO
KUMR-FM	University of Missouri	Rolla, MO
KEMC-FM	Eastern Montana College	Billings, MT
KRWG-FM	New Mexico State University	Las Cruces, NM
WUNC-FM	University of North Carolina	Chapel Hill, NC
WFAE-FM	University of North Carolina	Charlotte, NC
WFSS-FM	Fayetteville State University	Fayetteville, NC

STATION	LICENSEE	CITY, STATE
WTEB-FM	Craven Community College	New Bern, NC
KDSU-FM	North Dakota State University	Fargo, ND
KCSC-FM	Central State University	Edmond, OK
KOSU-FM	Oklahoma State University	Stillwater, OK
KLCC-FM	Lane Community College	Eugene, OR
WETS-FM	East Tennessee State University	Johnson City, TN
WUOT-FM	University of Tennessee	Knoxville, TN
KUT-FM	University of Texas	Austin, TX
KETR-FM	East Texas State University	Commerce, TX
KUHF-FM	University of Houston	Houston, TX
KUOW-FM	University of Washington	Seattle, WA

REFERENCES

Aaker, D. A., & Shansby, J. G. (1982). Positioning your product. Business Horizons, 25(3), 56-62.

Abrams, G.J. (1972, October 30). Positioning and creativity will fail without third element--Marketing. Advertising Age, pp. 134, 137.

Agee, W. K., Ault, P. H., & Emery, E. (1979). Introduction to mass communications (6th ed). New York: Harper & Row.

Alexander, F. J. (1978). Administrative opinions concerning utilization of marketing strategies in management of higher education institutions in the United States. (Doctoral dissertation, Memphis State University, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 4072A.

Altschiller, D. (1986, August 18). Exit the age of the big idea: Enter the age of no idea. Advertising Age, pp. 18, 28.

Arbitron Ratings. (1986, August 4). Advertising Age, pp. 8-9.

Barnouw, E. (1978). The sponsor: Notes on a modern potentate. New York: Oxford University Press.

Barnouw, E. (1982). A history of broadcasting in the United States (rev. ed., Vols. 1-3). New York: Oxford University Press.

Barton, D. W., Jr. (Ed.). (1978). Marketing higher education: New directions for higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bassin, W. M. (1975). A marketing technique for student recruitment. Research in Higher Education, 3, 51-65.

Baudino, J. E., & Kittross, J. M. (1977). Broadcasting's oldest stations: An examination of four claimants. Journal of Broadcasting, 21, 61-83.

Baumwoll, J. P. (1984, November 23). Sacrifice is the penance paid for effective positioning. Marketing News, pp. 3, 8.

Beder, H. (Ed.). (1986). Marketing continuing education: New directions for continuing education (No. 31). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Berry, L. L. (1982). Retail positioning strategies for the 1980s. Business Horizons, 25(6), 45-50.

Berry, L. L., & George, W. R. (1978). Marketing the university: Opportunity in an era of crisis. In P. J. Montana (Ed.), Marketing in nonprofit organizations (pp. 159-171). New York: AMACOM.

Blankenship, A. B. (1977). Professional telephone surveys. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Blume, D. (1983). Making it in radio. Hartford, CT: Continental Media.

Borden, N. H. (1965). The concept of the marketing mix. In G. Schwartz (Ed.), Science in marketing (pp. 386-397). New York: John Wiley.

Brant, B. G. (1981). The college radio handbook. Blue Ridge Summit, PA: TAB.

Broadcasting/cablecasting yearbook. (1988). Washington, DC: Broadcasting Publications.

Brozan, N. (1975, July 8). Lunch, for them, is on the house. The New York Times, p. 26.

Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (1968). Higher education in transition. New York: Harper & Row.

By the numbers: Summary of broadcasting and cable. (1988, October 3). Broadcasting, p. 16.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J.C. (1963). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Carnegie Commission on Educational Television. (1967). Public television: A program for action. New York: Bantam.

Carnegie Commission on the Future of Public Broadcasting. (1979). A public trust. New York: Bantam.

Champion, D. J. (1981). Basic statistics for social research (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Christiansen, K. A. (1949). The organization and administration of college and university radio programming (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1949). Dissertation Abstracts, 9, 60.

College Entrance Examination Board. (1980). Marketing in college admissions: A broadening of perspectives. New York: Author.

Cook, B. L. (1968). How are you going to educate 'em when they ain't there? Journal of Broadcasting, 12, 137-143.

Corporation for Public Broadcasting. (1987). Public broadcasting directory 1987-1988. Washington, DC: Author.

Crain raps positioning over product. (1973, April 16). Advertising Age, p. 24.

Cravens, D. W. (1975). Marketing strategy positioning. Business Horizons, 18(6), 53-61.

DeSonne, M. L. (1982). Radio new technology and you. Washington, DC: National Association of Broadcasters.

Dougherty, P.H. (1975, July 29). 'Positioning'--Goal for agencies. The New York Times, p. 41.

Drake, H. (1975, April). A select survey of campus radio stations. Paper presented at the meeting of the Southern States Speech Association, Tallahassee, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 177 633).

Dunagan, C. A. (1983). Commercialization of public broadcasting. Comm/Ent: A Journal of Communications and Entertainment Law, 5, 241-292.

Eastman, S. T., Head, S. W., & Klein, L. (1985). Broadcast/cable programming (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Eastman, S. T., & Klein, R. A. (Eds.). (1982). Strategies in broadcast and cable promotion. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Editorial Integrity Project. (1986). Public broadcasting governance and management handbook. Columbia, SC: Author.

Ennis, F. B. (1982, March 15). Positioning revisited. Advertising Age, pp. M-43, M-46-47.

Evans, G. (1986, January 22). Howard U.'s radio station rated no. 1 in highly competitive Washington area. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 3.

Federal Communications Commission. (1945). Report of allocations from 44-108 MC, June 27, 1945. Washington, DC: mimeographed by author.

Foltz, K. (1985, July 22). Wizards of marketing: How companies can look inside the consumer's head. Newsweek, pp. 42-44.

Fornatale, P., & Mills, J. E. (1980). Radio in the television age. Woodstock, NY: The Overlook Press.

Fox, D. J. (1969). The research process in education. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Fox, S. R. (1985). The mirror makers: A history of American advertising and its creators. New York: Vintage.

Fram, E. H. (1973). Marketing higher education. In D. W. Vermilye (Ed.), The future in the making: Current issues in higher education 1973. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Frazier, Gross, & Clay, Inc. (1977). Radio in 1985. Washington, DC: National Association of Broadcasters.

Frey, J. H. (1983). Survey research by telephone. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Frost, S. E., Jr. (1937a). Education's own stations. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Frost, S. E., Jr. (1937b). Is American radio democratic? Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Gallanis, B. (1984, May 3). Positioning old products in new niches. Advertising Age, p. M-50.

Games, P. A., & Klare, G. R. (1967). Elementary statistics: Data analysis for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Geddes, L. A. (1988). A century of progress: The history of electrical engineering at Purdue University. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.

Geibel, J. P. (1986, February 14). Positioning impacts marketing communications of new firms. Marketing News, pp. 23-24.

Geltzer, H., & Ries, A. (1975). Positioning in p.r. Public Relations Journal, 31(11), 40-43.

Geltzer, H., & Ries, A. (1976). The positioning era: Marketing strategy for college admissions in the 1980s. In College Entrance Examination Board (Ed.), A role for marketing in college admissions (pp. 73-85). New York: Author.

Gibson, G. H. (1977). Public broadcasting: The role of the federal government, 1912-76. New York: Praeger.

Gold, R. (1982, August 4). College radio recognized as sales tool: Non-pay formats are selling LPs. Variety, pp. 51, 54.

Greenland, L. (1972, July 10). Is this the era of positioning? Advertising Age, pp. 43-44, 46.

Hall, J. (1976, October). The business of radio promotion. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 134 176).

Havig, A. (1979). Beyond nostalgia: American radio as a field of study. Journal of Popular Culture, 12, 218-227.

Head, S. W. (1972). Broadcasting in America: A survey of television and radio (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Head, S. W., & Martin, L. A. (1957). Broadcasting and higher education: A new era. Journal of Broadcasting, 1, 39-46.

Hedges, M. (1986, February). Radio's lifestyles. American Demographics, pp. 32-35.

Hugstad, P. S. (1975). The marketing concept in higher education: A caveat. Liberal Education, 61, 504-512.

Ihlanfeldt, W. (1975). A management approach to the buyer's market. Liberal Education, 61, 133-148.

Ihlanfeldt, W. (1980). Achieving optimal enrollments and tuition revenues. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

James, W. L. (1981). The impact of market position on the effectiveness of comparative ads: A laboratory experiment (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 3732A.

Johnson, D. L. (1972, February). Market approach starts with product evaluation. College and University Business, pp. 48-51.

Johnson, J. S., & Jones, K. K. (1978). Modern radio station practices (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Josephson, L. (1979). Why radio? Public Telecommunication Review, 7(2), 6-18.

Kennedy, D. E. (1981). Listener perceptions as dimensions of radio station positioning: A multivariate analysis. (Doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 8A.

Kerr, C. (1972). The uses of the university. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kerr, J. S., II. (1979). Marketing: A management approach for public broadcasting. Public Telecommunications Review, 7(4), 22-26.

Kimbrough, R. B., & Nunnery, M. Y. (1976). Educational administration: An introduction. New York: Macmillan.

Kittross, J. M. (1978). A bibliography of theses and dissertations in broadcasting: 1920-1973. Washington, DC: Broadcast Education Association.

Klein, J. W. (1985, February 1). The best defense is to know what customers want and to do it better. Marketing News, p. 6.

Kotler, P. (1976). Applying marketing theory to college admissions. In College Entrance Examination Board (Ed.), A role for marketing in college admissions (pp. 54-72). New York: Author.

Kotler, P. (1979). Strategies for introducing marketing into nonprofit organizations. Journal of Marketing, 43, 37-44.

Kotler, P. (1984). Marketing management: Analysis, planning, and control (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kotler, P. (1986). Megamarketing. Harvard Business Review, 64(2), 117-124.

Kotler, P., & Andreasen, A. R. (1987). Strategic marketing for nonprofit organizations (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kotler, P., & Fox, K. F. A. (1985). Strategic marketing for educational organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kotler, P., & Levy, S. J. (1969). Broadening the concept of marketing. Journal of Marketing, 33, 1-15.

Kotler to receive first AMA Distinguished Educator Award. (1985, July 19). Marketing News, pp. 1, 31.

Krachenberg, A. R. (1972). Bringing the concept of marketing to higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 43, 369-380.

Kron, J. (1976, April 19). The media room. New York magazine, p. 55.

Landau, D. M. (1986, October). Special programming offers radio special opportunities. Broadcasting, p. 24.

Lashner, M. A. (1976). The role of foundations in public broadcasting--Part I: Development and trends. Journal of Broadcasting, 20, 529-547.

Leidman, M. B. (1985). At the crossroads: A descriptive study of noncommercial FM radio stations affiliated with colleges and universities of the early 1980s (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 1604A.

Leister, D. (1975). Identifying institutional clientele: Applied metamarketing in higher education administration. Journal of Higher Education, 46, 381-398.

Levitt, T. (1960). Marketing myopia. Harvard Business Review, 38(4), 45-56.

Levitt, T. (1962). Innovation in marketing. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Litten, L. H. (1979). Market structure and institutional position in geographic market segments. Research in Higher Education, 11, 59-83.

Litten, L. H. (1980). Marketing higher education: Benefits and risks for the American academic system. Journal of Higher Education, 51, 40-59.

Litten, L. H., Sullivan, D., & Brodigan, D. L. (1983). Applying market research in college admissions. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Lovelock, C. H., & Weinberg, C. B. (1984). Marketing for public and nonprofit managers. New York: John Wiley.

Lucas, J. A. (Ed.). (1979). Developing a total marketing plan: New directions for institutional research (No. 21). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lucoff, M. (1979). The university and public radio: Who's in charge? Public Telecommunications Review, 7(5), 22-26.

MacDonald, J. F., Marsden, M. T., & Geist, C. D. (1980). Radio and television studies and American culture. American Quarterly, 32, 301-317.

MacLachlan, J. (1984). Making a message memorable and persuasive. Journal of Advertising Research, 23(6), 51-58.

Margulies, W. P. (1980, December 15). Positioning the company a challenge in the 1980s. Advertising Age, p. 46.

Margulies, W. P. (1981, October 19). Strategic repositioning no 'design to go' tactic. Advertising Age, p. 71.

McCall raps the positioners; Trout says strategy is king. (1973, February 5). Advertising Age, pp. 3, 74.

McCarthy, E. J., & Perreault, W. D. (1984). Basic marketing: A managerial approach (9th ed.). Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.

McKenna, R. (1985). The Regis touch: Million-dollar advice from America's top marketing consultant. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

McMillan, J. H., & Shumacher, S. (1984). Research in education. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co.

Mendenhall, W., Ott, L., & Larson, R. F. (1974). Statistics: A tool for the social sciences. North Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press.

Meyer, L. R. (1980). Assessing institutional positioning for potential new student markets in lifelong learning: Applied metamarketing in higher education administration (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 962A.

Meyers, W. (1984). The image-makers: Power and persuasion on Madison Avenue. New York: Times Books.

Minow, M. N., & Minow, N. (1976, October). What are we learning from television? Change, pp. 48-49.

Mitchell, W. G. (1971). Behavioral objectives for public broadcasting. Educational/Instructional Broadcasting, 4(3), 28-29.

Montana, P. J. (Ed.). (1978). Marketing in nonprofit organizations. New York: AMACOM.

Neslin, S. A. (1986, January). Assessing the present marketing position of your school. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business, West Palm Beach, FL.

Nord, D. P. (1978). The FCC, educational broadcasting, and political interest group activity. Journal of Broadcasting, 22, 321-338.

Norusis, M. J. (1986). SPSS/PC+: SPSS for the IBM/PC/XT/AT. Chicago: SPSS, Inc.

Ogilvy, D. (1971, April 7). How to create advertising that sells. The New York Times, p. 56.

Ogilvy, D., & Raphaelson, J. (1982). Research on advertising techniques that work--and don't work. Harvard Business Review, 60(4), 14-15, 18.

Ozier, L. W. (1978). University broadcast licensees: Rx for progress. Public Telecommunications Review, 6(5), 33-39.

Papazian, E. (1984, March). Positioning: A team effort. Ad Forum, p. 19.

Pennybacker, J. H. (1965). Working with universities. Journal of Broadcasting, 9, 183-187.

Pennybacker, J. H. (1966). Leadership and the educator: The middle way. Journal of Broadcasting, 10, 67-70.

Positioning "positioning": What top ad executives have to say. (1972). Chicago: Crain Communications.

Quaal, W. L., & Brown, J. A. (1976). Broadcast management (rev. ed.). New York: Hastings House.

Radio Advertising Bureau. (1983). Radio facts. New York: Author.

Rados, D. L. (1981). Marketing for nonprofit organizations. Boston: Auburn House.

Reeves, R. (1981). The new buzzword. In J. Sacco (1985, October 17). Rosser Reeves' lost chapter. Advertising Age, p. 13.

Repositioning can do wonders for golden oldies. (1980, August 25). Advertising Age, p. 12.

Reymer, & Gersin Associates, Inc. (1983). Radio W.A.R.S.: How to survive the '80s. Washington, DC: National Association of Broadcasters.

Ries, A. (1974a). Tactics for the "shortage seventies": Today's crises--New opportunity for advertisers? Management Review, 63(9), 29-33.

Ries, A. (1974b, August 26). The positioning strategy for successful advertising. Broadcasting, p. 11.

Ries, A. (1977, February). Military guide to media planning. Media Decisions, pp. 76-78, 114.

Ries, A., & Trout, J. (1981). Positioning: The battle for your mind. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ries, A., & Trout, J. (1986). Marketing warfare. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Robertson, J., & Yokom, G. G. (1973). Educational radio: The fifty-year-old adolescent. Educational Broadcasting Review, 7(2), 107-115.

Roscoe, J. T. (1975). Fundamental research statistics for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Rosenfeld, Sirowitz, & Lawson, Inc. (1971, April 12). We congratulate our partner, Ron Rosenfeld, on his election to The Copywriters' Hall of Fame. Write on, Ron. The New York Times, p. 61.

Ross, N. (1986, December 14). Americans retreat to an electronic island. The Tampa Tribune-Times, pp. 1-H, 7-H.

Roth, M. (1983, May 4). "Positioning" new darling of Chicago radio execs. Variety, pp. 511, 523.

Rowland, W. D., Jr. (1986). Continuing crisis in public broadcasting: A history of disenfranchisement. Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media, 30, 251-274.

Saunders, R. R. (1981, June 22). A creative sampler. Advertising Age, pp. 49-50.

Sax, G. (1974). Principles of educational measurement and evaluation. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Severin, W. J. (1978). Commercial vs. non-commercial radio during broadcasting's early years. Journal of Broadcasting, 22, 491-504.

Shaffer, P. B. (1978). The identification of market positions of Wisconsin private colleges (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 2672A.

Shapiro, B. P. (1973). Marketing for nonprofit organizations. Harvard Business Review, 51(5), 123-132.

Siemering, W. H. (1969). Public broadcasting--Some essential ingredients. Educational/Instructional Broadcasting, 2(9), 65-69.

Slower, but steady growth seen for VCRs, stereo TVs. (1986, January 13). Broadcasting, p. 188.

Smith, F. L. (1979). Perspectives on radio and television. New York: Harper & Row.

Smith, R. E., & Lusch, R. F. (1976). How advertising can position a brand. Journal of Advertising Research, 16(1), 37-43.

Sparks, K. R. (1962). A bibliography of doctoral dissertations in television and radio. Syracuse, NY: School of Journalism, Newhouse Communications Center, Syracuse University.

Springer, J. (1972, September 4). Put people in positioning, new product expert says. Advertising Age, pp. 31-32.

Standard directory of advertising agencies. (1986). Wilmette, IL: National Register.

Stein, J. W. (1979). Mass media, education, and a better society. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Steinberg, J. (1986, August 4). Tuning in strong market signals. Advertising Age, pp. S-1, S-2.

Sudman, S., & Bradburn, N. M. (1982). Asking questions: A practical guide to questionnaire design. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Taylor, R. E., & Judd, L. L. (1987). Marketing higher education: A distribution consideration. In J. J. Cronin, Jr., & M. T. Stith (Eds.), Marketing: Meeting the challenges of the 1990s (pp. 282-285). Tallahassee, FL: Southern Marketing Association.

Ted Bolton Associates. (1984). The critical issues report: Radio from 1984-1990. Philadelphia: Author.

Temporary Commission on Alternative Financing for Public Telecommunications. (1983). Final report. Washington, DC: Federal Communications Commission.

Thompson, F. (1979). The cost and value of marketing analysis. Research in Higher Education, 10(1), 83-93.

Toffler, A. (1980). The third wave. New York: William Morrow.

Tricks to proper positioning. (1981, August 24). Broadcasting, pp. 26, 28.

Troldahl, V. C., & Skolnik, R. (1968). The meanings people have for radio today. Journal of Broadcasting, 12, 57-67.

Trout, J. (1969, June). "Positioning" is a game people play in today's me-too market place. Industrial Marketing, pp. 52-55.

Trout, J. (1971, November). Positioning revisited: Why didn't GE and RCA listen? Industrial Marketing, pp. 116-118.

Trout, J. (1976). Marketing in the '70s: Product positioning. The Conference Board Record, 13, pp. 41-44.

Trout, J., & Ries, A. (1972a, April 24). The positioning era cometh. Advertising Age, pp. 35, 38.

Trout, J., & Ries, A. (1972b, May 1). Positioning cuts through chaos in marketplace. Advertising Age, pp. 51-52, 54.

Trout, J., & Ries, A. (1972c, May 8). How to position your product. Advertising Age, pp. 114, 116.

Trout, J., & Ries, A. (1979, July). Positioning: Ten years later. Industrial Marketing, pp. 32-33, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44.

Trout & Ries take position. (1979, July 13). The New York Times, p. D11.

Turner, W. H. (1982). Market positioning: A research approach for higher education (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 2905A.

United States Code, Title 47, 5303, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Urban, G. L., & Neslin, S. A. (1977). The design and marketing of new educational programs (Working paper 873-76). Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Sloan School of Management.

Villarreal Camacho, M.A. (1983). Comparative advertising: A communication strategy for positioning products (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 623A.

Wademan, V. (1976, August). Panacea of positioning--Another formula for getting things done. Industrial Marketing, pp. 34, 37.

Wagner, P. A. (1978). Marketing for NPOs--From a practitioner's point of view. In P. J. Montana (Ed.), Marketing in nonprofit organizations (pp. 38-51). New York: AMACOM.

Waller, J. C. (1946). Radio: The fifth estate. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Warwick, K. M., & Sands S. (1975). Product positioning: Problems and promises. University of Michigan Business Review, 27(6), 17-20.

Whitney, S. (1985, June 20). AM and FM promotions pull no punches. Advertising Age, pp. 32-33.

Wiersma, W. (1986). Research methods in education (4th ed). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Williams, C. (1981). Lead, follow or get out of the way: The story of Ted Turner. New York: Times Books.

Williams, F. (1983). The communications revolution. New York: Mentor Books.

Wilms, W. W., & Moore, R. W. (Eds.). (1987). Marketing strategies for changing times: New directions for community colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Woodliff, C. M. (1965). Catch me if you can. Journal of Broadcasting, 9, 329-332.

Wurtzel, A. H. (1980). Academic research: A view from the industry. Journal of Broadcasting, 24, 479-486.

Zotti, E. (1985). Thinking psychographically. Public Relations Journal, 41(5), 26-30.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Carolyn Elizabeth Poole is a native of Chicago, Illinois, where she received primary and secondary education in the suburban Flossmoor school district. During her senior year of high school, she performed with a singing group on concert tour throughout Europe and the Soviet Union.

Carolyn graduated from Purdue University in 1974 with a Bachelor of Arts degree in social science education and music history. She obtained a Master of Education degree in higher education administration and educational psychology from University of Illinois in 1975. That year she also accepted a national fellowship award from the Education Professions Development Act to pursue a community college leadership training program at University of Florida. In 1976 she received the Specialist in Education degree from University of Florida in higher education administration and student personnel, with community college emphasis. During her academic career, she was initiated into membership of Kappa Delta Pi, Pi Delta Phi, and Phi Delta Kappa national honor societies.

Carolyn has had professional experience at both public and private colleges in the areas of counseling, teaching,

and administration. She has also worked as an announcer, programmer, newscaster, videographer, and media consultant in both commercial and noncommercial broadcasting. Her professional aspirations include ownership and management of a broadcast or cable outlet.

Carolyn's personal passions are music and photography. After the long hiatus in doctoral study, she looks forward to intimate reaquaintance with her Pentax camera, while anchored in any gunkhole around Sarasota Bay.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

James L. Wattenbarger, Chair
Professor of Educational Leadership

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

C. Arthur Sandeen
Professor of Educational Leadership

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Phyllis M. Meek
Associate Professor of Counselor Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Joseph R. Pisani
Professor of Journalism and Communications

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the College of Education and to the Graduate School and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

August, 1989

David E. Smith
Dean, College of Education

Dean, Graduate School